arXiv:1104.4675v1 [math.QA] 25 Apr 2011

Flatness and Semi-Rigidity of Vertex Operator Algebras

Masahiko Miyamoto
Institute of Mathematics,
University of Tsukuba,
Tsukuba, 305 Japan

Abstract

In VOA theories, most of the general theorems are proved under the assumption of rationality and C_2-cofiniteness. In this paper, we obtain several general theorems without the assumption of rationality so that we can use them for proving rationality of given C_2-cofinite VOAs. For example, we apply them to orbifold models and show that if g is a finite automorphism of a rational C_2-cofinite VOA T of CFT-type with $T' \cong T$ and a fixed point subVOA $V := T^g$ is a C_2-cofinite, then V is also rational. We also investigate several results under weaker conditions.

1 Introduction

In this paper, we summarize results given in three preprints [15],[16] and [17] and extend some of them under weaker conditions. In the research of vertex operator algebras (shortly VOAs), most of the general theorems are proved under the assumptions of rationality (i.e. all modules are completely reducible) and C_2-cofiniteness. Our aim is to develop general theorems without the assumption of rationality so that we can use them in the aim of proving rationality of given VOAs. Our main target is an orbifold model. Throughout this paper, T denotes a VOA with an automorphism g of order n. Set $T^{(k)} = \{t \in T \mid g(t) = e^{2\pi ik/n}t\}$, then $T = \oplus_{k=0}^{n-1} T^{(k)}$ and $T^g = T^{(0)}$ is a subVOA.

Let $V = \oplus_{n=0}^{\infty} V_n$ be a VOA. In an orbifold module, we will study $T^{(0)}$ as a targeted VOA V. In [16] and [17], the author have shown several results under the assumption that V is C_2-cofinite. We will study some of them under weaker conditions.

Let $\mathrm{Irr}(V)$ and $\mathrm{mod}(V)$ denote the set of irreducible V-modules and that of $\mathbb{N}$-graded V-modules with composition series of finite length. In this paper, for $U, W \in \mathrm{mod}(V)$, we will define a fusion product $U \boxtimes W$ as a projective limit in §3. As we will explain, $U \boxtimes W$ may not be a V-module, but $W \boxtimes U$ satisfies all conditions to be a V-module except for the lower truncation property and it is possible to define the n-th action v_n of $v \in V$ on $W \boxtimes U$ and we are able to consider V-homomorphisms from $W \boxtimes U$ to V-modules.

For an orbifold model, we will show:

Proposition 20 *Let T be a VOA and $g \in \mathrm{Aut}(V)$ of order n. If all $T^{(k)}$ are C_1-cofinite as V-modules and $T^{(k)} \boxtimes T^{(1)}$ are V-modules, then all $T^{(k)}$ are simple currents.*

Our definition of "C_1-cofinite as a V-module" is slightly different from an ordinary definition of C_1-cofiniteness, see §2.3. A surjection $\alpha : D \to C$ of V-modules is called "covering" of C when D is the unique submodule of D satisfying $\alpha(D) = C$. We sometimes call D a cover of C. The flatness property (i.e. preserving the exactness) of the tensor products is important in an ordinary ring theory. Unfortunately, in VOA theory, we need some assumption to expect it. We first pay attention to the following short exact sequences.

Theorem 11 *Let V be a VOA and $\rho : P \to V$ a covering of V as V-modules. If the weights of $\mathrm{Ker}(\rho) \boxtimes U$ are bounded below for $U \in \mathrm{mod}(V)$, then*

$$0 \to \mathrm{Ker}(\rho) \boxtimes U \xrightarrow{\epsilon \boxtimes \mathrm{id}_U} P \boxtimes U \xrightarrow{\rho \boxtimes \mathrm{id}_U} V \boxtimes U \to 0$$

is exact, where $\epsilon : \mathrm{Ker}(\rho) \to P$ is an embedding and id_U denotes the identity map on U.

Since we do not assume rationality, we have to prepare for a non-semisimple category. One important concept we will introduce is "semi-rigidity", which is a non-semisimple version of the rigidity.

Definition 1 *$W \in \mathrm{mod}(V)$ is called to be* **semi-rigid** *if there is $\widetilde{W} \in \mathrm{mod}(V)$, $e_W \in \mathrm{Hom}_V(W \boxtimes \widetilde{W}, V)$ and $e_{\widetilde{W}} \in \mathrm{Hom}_V(\widetilde{W} \boxtimes W, V)$ such that*
(1) $W, \widetilde{W}$ are C_1-cofinite as V-modules and $W \boxtimes \widetilde{W}$ and $W \boxtimes (\widetilde{W} \boxtimes W)$ are V-modules,
(2) there are a V-module Q and an embedding $\epsilon : Q \to \widetilde{W} \boxtimes W$ such that $e_{\widetilde{W}}\epsilon : Q \to V$ is a covering and
(3) in the diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
W \boxtimes Q \arrow[r, "\mathrm{id}_W \boxtimes \epsilon"] & W \boxtimes (\widetilde{W} \boxtimes W) \arrow[r, "\mathrm{id}_W \boxtimes e_{\widetilde{W}}"] \arrow[d, "\mu"] & W \boxtimes V \\
 & (W \boxtimes \widetilde{W}) \boxtimes W \arrow[r, "e_W \boxtimes \mathrm{id}_W"] & V \boxtimes W
\end{tikzcd} \qquad (1.1)$$

$(e_W \boxtimes \mathrm{id}_W)\mu(\mathrm{id}_W \boxtimes \epsilon)$ is surjective, where $\mu : W \boxtimes (\widetilde{W} \boxtimes W) \to (W \boxtimes \widetilde{W}) \boxtimes W$ is a natural isomorphism for the associativity of products of intertwining operators (see (5.3)).

Clearly, every simple current is semi-rigid, in particular, so is V. We will prove the following theorems:

Theorem 14 *If C is a semi-rigid irreducible module and $D \xrightarrow{\alpha} C$ is a covering of C, then there is a covering $R \xrightarrow{\rho} V$ such that D is a homomorphic image of $R \boxtimes C$. In particular, if V has a projective cover P_V and $P_V \boxtimes C$ is finitely generated, then C has a projective cover P_C which is isomorphic to a direct summand of $P_V \boxtimes C$.*

Therefore, if V is projective as a V-module, then all semi-rigid irreducible modules are projective (Corollary 15).

Theorem 16 *Let V be a C_2-cofinite VOA of CFT-type and C a semi-rigid V-module. Then*

$$0 \to \mathrm{Ker}(\rho_C) \boxtimes W \xrightarrow{\epsilon \boxtimes \mathrm{id}_W} P_C \boxtimes W \xrightarrow{\rho_C \boxtimes \mathrm{id}_W} C \boxtimes W \to 0$$

is exact, where $0 \to \mathrm{Ker}(\rho_C) \xrightarrow{\epsilon} P_C \xrightarrow{\rho_C} C \to 0$ *is a projective cover of* C.

As corollaries, we have the following for a C_2-cofinite VOA V.
(1). If all V-modules are semi-rigid, then all V-modules are flat, that is, fusion products preserve the exactness.
(2). If all V-modules are semi-rigid and V is projective as a V-module, then V is rational. [Corollary 17]

Since V has integer weights, the investigations of its extensions are easier than those of other modules. For example, we will show the following for any VOA V.
(3). If a simple VOA V contains a rational subVOA with the same Virasoro element, then V is projective as a V-module. [Corollary 13]

We first introduce a weaker condition than $V' \cong V$.

Condition I: *Let* V *be a simple VOA and for each* $W \in \mathrm{mod}(V)$, *there is* $\widetilde{W} \in \mathrm{mod}(V)$ *such that* $\mathrm{Hom}_V(W \boxtimes \widetilde{W}, V) \neq 0$.

If $V' \cong V$, then we can take a restricted dual W' of W as $\widetilde{W}$. We remark that if products of intertwining operators satisfies the associativity, then since there is an epimorphism $W \boxtimes W' \to V'$ by adjoint operators and $(W \boxtimes W') \boxtimes Q \cong W \boxtimes (W' \boxtimes Q)$, Condition I comes from the following:

Condition I': *There is* $Q \in \mathrm{mod}(V)$ *such that* $\mathrm{Hom}_V(V' \boxtimes Q, V) \neq 0$.

Our next aim is to find a condition under which all V-modules become semi-rigid. Let us consider a trace function of v on an irreducible V-module $W = \oplus_{n=0}^{\infty} W_{n+r}$:

$$\Psi_W(v,\tau) = \mathrm{Tr}_W(o(v)q^{(L(0)-c/24)}) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty}(\mathrm{Tr}_{W_{r+n}}o(v))q^{(n+r-c/24)} \qquad \text{for } v \in V$$

and define a map

$$\Psi_W(*,\tau) : v \in V \mapsto \Psi_W(v,\tau),$$

where q denotes $e^{2\pi i\tau}$, c is a central charge of V and $o(v)$ denotes a grade-preserving operator of v on W, (e.g. $o(v) = v^M_{\mathrm{wt}(v)-1}$ for $v \in V_{\mathrm{wt}(v)}$ and $Y^M(v,z) = \sum v^M_n z^{-n-1}$). Abusing the notation, we will also call Ψ_W trace functions. We then consider its S-transformation $S(\Psi_V)$ (corresponding to $\begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \in SL_2(\mathbb{Z})$). It satisfies

$$S(\Psi_V)(v,\tau) = (\frac{-1}{\tau})^{\mathrm{wt}(v)}\Psi_V(v,-1/\tau)$$

for $v \in V_{\mathrm{wt}(v)}$ with $L(1)v = L(2)v = 0$. As the author has shown in [14], if V is C_2-cofinite, then $S(\Psi_V)$ equals a linear combination of trace functions and pseudo-trace functions. In the case where V is rational, $S(\Psi_V)$ has no pseudo-trace functions, as Zhu has shown in [21].

We will consider the following condition:

Condition II: $S(\Psi_V)$ is a linear combination of trace functions on V-modules.

Condition II looks strong, but for an orbifold model, we have:

Theorem 27 *Let T be a VOA of CFT-type with a finite automorphism g and assume that a fixed point subVOA T^g is C_2-cofinite. If T satisfies Condition II, so does T^g.*

The key result for orbifold model is the following:

Theorem 26 *If V satisfies Condition I and Condition II, then all simple V-modules are semi-rigid. Furthermore, if V is a rational VOA of CFT-type satisfying Condition I, then Ψ_U has nonzero coefficient in $S(\Psi_V)$ for every simple V-module U.*

As a corollary, we will prove:

Corollary 28 *Let g be a finite automorphism of a VOA T and assume that a fixed point subVOA $V := T^g$ is a C_2-cofinite of CFT-type and satisfies Condition I, If T is rational and V satisfies Condition I, then V is rational. Moreover, for a simple V-module W, there are $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ and a g^k-twisted T-module U such that W is a V-submodule of U.*

We organize this paper in the following way. We treat a fusion produce as a projective limit of intertwining operators in Section 3. In Section 5, as an application of fusion products, we present a product of two intertwining operators by a homomorphism. This will be one of the main tools in this paper. In Subsection 4.1 we show that the principal projective cover preserves the exactness with respect to the fusion products. In Section 6, we study an orbifold model under weaker conditions than C_2-cofiniteness. We study three transformations in Section 8 and prove that all modules are semi-rigid under some condition. In Section 9 and 10, we prove an orbifold conjecture under the assumption that a fixed point subVOA is C_2-cofinite.

Acknowledgement
The author would like to express special thanks to H. Yamauchi and T. Arakawa for giving me the chance to explain the detail of his proofs. He thanks T. Abe, K. Harada, A. Matsuo, K. Naoi, H. Yamada and K. Tanabe for their pointed questions. He also thanks to G. Höhn, V. Nikulin and N. Scheithauer, the organizers of the conference held at Edinburgh in 2009 where he was stimulated to extend his results to general cases.

2 Preliminary results

2.1 Notation

Throughout this paper, V denotes a VOA $(V = \oplus_{i=0}^{\infty}, Y(\cdot, z), \mathbf{1}, \omega)$, where ω is a Virasoro element, $\mathbf{1}$ is the vacuum, and $Y(v,z) = \sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} v_n z^{-n-1} \in \mathrm{End}(V)[[z,z^{-1}]]$ denotes a vertex operator of $v \in V$ satisfying the conditions $1 \sim 4$ in Definition 2 by replacing all W, U, R by V. We also have $Y(\mathbf{1}, z) = \mathrm{id}_V$, $\lim_{z\to 0} Y(v,z)\mathbf{1} = v$ and the coefficients of $Y(\omega, z)$ satisfy the Virasoro algebra relations. If $W = V$, $U = R = M$ in Definition 2 and a set

$$\{Y^M(v,z) = \sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} v_n^M z^{-n-1} \in \mathrm{End}(M)[[z,z^{-1}]] \mid v \in V\}$$

satisfies the same conditions $1 \sim 4$, then M is called a V-module (including weak modules). We use notation "wt" (weight) to denote the semisimple part of $L(0)$ and $L(0)^{nil}$ to denote $L(0) - \mathrm{wt}$. All modules in this paper are $\mathbb{C}$-graded $M = \oplus_{r\in\mathbb{C}} M_r$ by weights excepted as otherwise noted, that is, they are direct sums of generalized eigenspaces M_r of $L(0)$ with eigenvalue r. For a $\mathbb{C}$-graded module $M = \oplus_{n\in\mathbb{C}} M_r$, M' denotes the restricted dual V-module $\oplus_{r\in\mathbb{C}} \mathrm{Hom}(M_r,\mathbb{C})$, where an adjoint vertex operator $Y^{M'}(v,z)$ on M' is given by

$$\langle Y^{M'}(v,z)w', w\rangle = \langle w', Y(e^{zL(1)}(-z^{-2})^{L(0)}v, z^{-1})w\rangle$$

for $w' \in M'$ and $w \in M$, where $\langle w', w\rangle$ denotes $w'(w)$, see [6].

2.2 (logarithmic) intertwining operators

Similar to a vertex operator $Y^M(v,z) = \sum v_n^M z^{-n-1} \in \mathrm{End}(M)[[z,z^{-1}]]$ on a module M, it is natural to consider an intertwining operator from a module U to another module R as a formal power series ([20]). However, without the assumption of rationality, there is no reason for all intertwining operators to have specific forms like formal power series. As Huang has shown in [10], if a V-module W is C_1-cofinite, then all intertwining operators $\mathcal{Y}$ of type $\binom{R}{W\,U}$ has a shape of formal power series with $\log z$ terms:

$$\mathcal{Y}(w,z) = \sum_{i=0}^{K}\sum_{m\in\mathbb{C}} w^{\mathcal{Y}}_{(i,m)} z^{-m-1}\log^i z \in \mathrm{Hom}(U,R)\{z\}[\log z]$$

and is called "logarithmic type" (see [18],[8] and [5]). As long as we have a possibility to treat non-semisimple modules, it is necessary to consider all of such operators. In this paper, we will call them intertwining operators, too.

Definition 2 *Let W, U and R be $\mathbb{N}$-graded V-modules. A (logarithmic) intertwining operator of type $\binom{R}{W\,U}$ is a linear map*

$$\mathcal{Y}(\,,z) : W \to \mathrm{Hom}(U,R)\{z\}[\log(z)]$$
$$\mathcal{Y}(w,z) = \sum_{i=0}^{k}\sum_{m\in\mathbb{C}} w_{(i,m)} z^{-m-1}\log^i z$$

satisfying the following conditions:
1. The lower truncation property: for each $u \in U$ and i, $w_{(i,r)}u = 0$ for $\mathrm{Re}(r) \gg 0$, where $\mathrm{Re}(r)$ denotes the real part of $r \in \mathbb{C}$.
2. $L(-1)$-derivative property: $\mathcal{Y}(L(-1)w,z) = \frac{d}{dz}\mathcal{Y}(w,z)$ for $w \in W$.
3. Commutativity: $v_n^R\mathcal{Y}(w,z) - \mathcal{Y}(w,z)v_n^U = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty}\binom{n}{i}\mathcal{Y}(v_i^W w,z)z^{n-i}$ for $v \in V$.
4. Associativity: for $v \in V$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\mathcal{Y}(v_n^W w,z) = \sum_{m=0}^{\infty}(-1)^m\binom{n}{m}v^R_{-m-1}z^m\mathcal{Y}(w,z) + \mathcal{Y}(w,z)\sum_{m=0}^{\infty}(-1)^{m+n+1}\binom{n}{m}v^U_m z^{-m-1}.$$

Here and henceforth, $Y^X(v,z)=\sum v^X_n z^{-n-1}$ denotes a vertex operator of $v\in V$ on a V-module X and $\mathcal{I}\binom{R}{W\,U}$ denotes the set of intertwining operators of type $\binom{R}{W\,U}$.

Let $\mathcal{Y}^{(i)}(w,z):=\sum_{n\in\mathbb{C}} w_{(i,n)}z^{-n-1}$ denote the coefficient of $\log^i z$ in $\mathcal{Y}(w,z)$ for $i=0,1,...,K$, If W is finitely generated, then there is an integer K such that $\mathcal{Y}^{(n)}(w,z)=0$ for any $n>K$ and $w\in W$. Moreover, since vertex operators $Y^M(v,z)$ on modules M have no "log$z$" terms, every $\mathcal{Y}^{(i)}$ satisfies all properties of intertwining operators except the $L(-1)$-derivative property. From the $L(-1)$-derivative property for $\mathcal{Y}$, we have two important properties:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{Y}^{(m)}(w,z)=&\ \frac{1}{m!}(z\frac{d}{dz}-zL(-1))^m\mathcal{Y}^{(0)}(w,z), \qquad \text{and}\\ (i+1)w_{(i+1,n)}u=&\ -L(0)^{nil}w_{(i,n)}u+(L(0)^{nil}w)_{(i,n)}u+w_{(i,n)}(L(0)^{nil}u).\end{aligned} \tag{2.1}$$

In particular, we have

$$(z\frac{d}{dz}-zL(-1))^{K+1}\mathcal{Y}^{(i)}(w,z)=0 \quad \text{for any } i. \tag{2.2}$$

On the other hand, for such a formal power series $\mathcal{Y}^0$ satisfying all conditions in Definition 2 except $L(-1)$-derivative property but (2.2),

$$\mathcal{Y}(w,z)=\sum_{i=0}^{K}\left\{\frac{1}{i!}(zL(-1)-z\frac{d}{dz})^i\mathcal{Y}^0(w,z)\right\}\log^i z \tag{2.3}$$

is an intertwining operator. We note that $\sum_{i=0}^K\mathcal{Y}^{(i)}(w,ze^{2\pi i})(\log z+1)^i$ is also an intertwining operator for $\sum_{i=0}^K\mathcal{Y}^{(i)}(w,z)\log^i z\in\mathcal{I}\binom{*}{W\,*}$.

We also note that if $L(0)$ acts on W semisimply and $\mathcal{Y}\in\mathcal{I}\binom{U}{W\,U}$, then since $L(0)^{nil}$ is a nilpotent operator and commutes with all grade-preserving operators, the trace of $w_{(i,\mathrm{wt}(w)-1)}q^{L(0)}$ on U is zero for $i\geq 1$ by (2.1), where $\mathcal{Y}(w,z)=\sum_{i,n}w_{(i,n)}z^{-n-1}\log^i z$. Therefore, the followings come from (2.1).

Lemma 3 *(1) If $L(0)$ acts on W semisimply, then* $\mathrm{Tr}_U\mathcal{Y}(w,z)q^{L(0)}=\mathrm{Tr}_U\mathcal{Y}^{(0)}(w,z)q^{L(0)}$ *for $\mathcal{Y}\in\mathcal{I}^U_{W,U}$.*
(2) If $L(0)$ acts on W,U,R semi-simply, then every $\mathcal{Y}\in\mathcal{I}\binom{R}{W\,U}$ is a formal power series.

2.3 C_m-cofiniteness for a module

For a V-module W and $m\in\mathbb{N}$, set

$$C_m(W)=\langle v_{-m}w\mid v\in V,\mathrm{wt}(v)>0,w\in W\rangle.$$

If $\dim W/C_m(W)<\infty$, then we call W to be C_m-cofinite as a V-module. Our C_1-cofiniteness is slightly different from the ordinary definition of C_1-cofinite. For example, V is always C_1-cofinite as a V-module. Among these finiteness conditions, C_2-cofiniteness is the most important and offers many nice properties. For example, we have:

Proposition 4 *Let V be a C_2-cofinite VOA. Then we have the followings:*
(i) Every weak module is $\mathbb{Z}_+$-gradable and weights are all rational numbers [15].

(ii) Evey n-th Zhu algebra $A_n(V)$ is finite dimension and the number of inequivalent simple modules is finite, [9],[3].
(iii) Set $V = B + C_2(V)$ for a finite dimensional subspace B spanned by homogeneous elements. Then for any weak module W generated from one element w has the following spanning set $\{v^1_{n_1}....v^k_{n_k}w \mid v^i \in B, \quad n_1 < \cdots < n_k\}$. In particular, every V-module is C_n-cofinite as a V-module for any $n = 1, 2, ...,$ [15],[2],[9].

We note that except Condition I, all conditions in this paper are satisfied by a simple C_2-cofinite VOA and its simple modules.

3 Fusion products

In this section, for $W, U \in \mathrm{mod}(V)$ we explain a fusion product $W \boxtimes U$ defined by intertwining operators as a projective limit. We call an intertwining operator

$$\mathcal{Y}(w, z) = \sum_{i=0}^{K} \sum_{m\in\mathbb{C}} w_{(i,m)} z^{-m-1} \log^i z$$

of type $\binom{\ \ T\ \ }{W\ \ U}$ "surjective" if the images of coefficients of $\mathcal{Y}$ spans T, that is,

$$\langle w_{(i,m)}u \mid w \in W, u \in U, m \in \mathbb{C}, i = 0, ..., K\rangle_{\mathbb{C}} = T.$$

Consider the set of surjective intertwining operators of W:

$$\mathcal{F}(W, U) = \{(\mathcal{Y}, F) \mid F \in \mathrm{mod}(V), \mathcal{Y} \in \mathcal{I}\binom{F}{W\,U} \text{ is surjective}\} \tag{3.1}$$

and introduce an equivalent relation $(\mathcal{Y}_1, F^1) \cong (\mathcal{Y}_2, F^2)$ if there is an isomorphism $\sigma : F^1 \to F^2$ such that $\mathcal{Y}_2 = \sigma\mathcal{Y}_1$. We define a partial order $\leq$ in $\mathcal{F}(W, U)/\cong$ as follows:
For $(\mathcal{Y}_1, F^1), (\mathcal{Y}_2, F^2) \in \mathcal{F}(W, U)$,
$\mathcal{Y}_1 \leq \mathcal{Y}_2 \Leftrightarrow {}^{\exists}f \in \mathrm{Hom}_V(F^2, F^1)$ s.t. $f\mathcal{Y}_2 = \mathcal{Y}_1$.

Clearly, if $\mathcal{Y}_1 \leq \mathcal{Y}_2$ and $\mathcal{Y}_2 \leq \mathcal{Y}_1$, then we have $(\mathcal{Y}_1, F^1) \cong (\mathcal{Y}_2, F^2)$.

Lemma 5 *$\mathcal{F}(W, U)/\cong$ is a (right) directed set.*

[**Proof**] For any $\mathcal{Y}_1, \mathcal{Y}_2 \in \mathcal{F}(W, U)$, say $\mathcal{Y}_1 \in \mathcal{I}\binom{F^1}{W\,U}$ and $\mathcal{Y}_2 \in \mathcal{I}\binom{F^2}{W,U}$, we define $\mathcal{Y}$ by

$$\mathcal{Y}(w, z)u = (\mathcal{Y}_1(w, z)u, \mathcal{Y}_2(w, z)u) \in (F^1 \times F^2)\{z\}[\log z] \qquad \text{for } w \in W, u \in V.$$

Clearly, $\mathcal{Y}$ is an intertwining operator of type $\binom{F^1\times F^2}{W\,U}$. Let $F \subseteq F^1 \times F^2$ denote the subspace spanned by all images of coefficients of $\mathcal{Y}(w, z)u$ with $w \in W, u \in U$, then since F_1 and F_2 have composition series of finite length, so does F and so $(\mathcal{Y}, F) \in \mathcal{F}(W, U)$. By the projections $\pi_i : F^1 \times F^2 \to F^i$, we have $\pi_1(\mathcal{Y}) = \mathcal{Y}_1$ and $\pi_2(\mathcal{Y}) = \mathcal{Y}_2$, that is, $(\mathcal{Y}_1, F^1) \leq (\mathcal{Y}, F)$ and $(\mathcal{Y}_2, F^2) \leq (\mathcal{Y}, F)$ as we desired. ∎

Set $\mathcal{F}(W, U) = \{(\mathcal{Y}_i, F^i) \mid i \in I\}$ and consider the product $(\prod_i \mathcal{Y}_i, \prod_i F^i)$. Let $F_{(r)}$ be a subspace of $\prod T_i$ spanned by all coefficients $\prod w^{\mathcal{Y}_i}_{\mathrm{wt}(w)-1-r+\mathrm{wt}(u)}u$ of weights r for homogeneous elements $w \in W$ and $u \in U$ and we set $F = \coprod_{r\in\mathbb{C}} F_{(r)}$ and we consider $(F, \prod_i \mathcal{Y}^i)$.

Definition 6 *We call F a "fusion product" of W and U and we denote it by $W \boxtimes U$.*

Namely, we define a fusion product as a projective limit of $\mathcal{F}(W,U)/\cong$. We note that $U \boxtimes W$ may not be a V-module, but $W \boxtimes U$ satisfies all conditions to be a V-modules except for the lower truncation property. Hence if the set of conformal weights of F^i in $\mathcal{F}(W,U)$ has a lower bound, then $W \boxtimes U$ is a V-module and $\prod \mathcal{Y}^i$ is a surjective intertwining operator of type $\binom{W\boxtimes U}{W\ \ U}$. We also note that even if $W \boxtimes U$ is not a V-module, it is possible to define the actions v_n on $W \boxtimes U$ and we are able to consider V-homomorphisms from $W \boxtimes U$ to V-modules. In any case, $U \boxtimes W$ is $\mathbb{C}$-graded by the construction. Throughout this paper, we fix one surjective intertwining operator $\mathcal{Y}^{\boxtimes}_{A,B} \in \mathcal{I}\binom{A\boxtimes B}{A\ B}$ for each pair $A, B \in \mathrm{mod}(V)$.

We next show:

Proposition 7 *Let $W, U \in \mathrm{mod}(V)$. If an n-th Zhu bi-module $A_n(W)$ is of finite dimensional for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, then $\mathcal{F}(W,U)$ contains a unique maximal element. In other words, a fusion product $W \boxtimes U$ is well-defined as an element of* $\mathrm{mod}(V)$.

Before we start the proof, we give a brief review of an n-th Zhu algebra $A_n(V)$ and an n-th Zhu bi-module $A_n(W)$ from a view point of operators. For $\mathbb{N}$-graded modules $U = \oplus_{i=0}^{\infty} U_{i+r}$ and $F = \oplus_{i=0}^{\infty} F_{i+t}$ with lowest weights r and t, respectively, we restrict our interest into operators

$$o^{\mathcal{Y}}_{t-r}(w) = w^{\mathcal{Y}}_{(0,\mathrm{wt}(w)-1+r-t)} : \oplus_{j=0}^{n} U_{j+r} \to \oplus_{j=0}^{n} F_{j+t},$$

where $\mathcal{Y}(w,z) = \sum_{i=0}^{K} \sum_{m\in\mathbb{C}} w^{\mathcal{Y}}_{(i,m)} z^{-m-1} \log^i z \in \mathcal{I}\binom{F}{W\ U}$ of $w \in W$ and $o^{\mathcal{Y}}_{s}(w)$ denotes an operator of w in $\mathcal{Y}^{(0)}(w,z)$ shifting grade by s. From Associativity and Commutativity, for $v \in V$ and $w \in W$, we can find $v*w$ and $w*v$ in W such that $o^{\mathcal{Y}}_{t-r}(v*w) = o_0(v) o^{\mathcal{Y}}_{t-r}(w)$ and $o^{\mathcal{Y}}_{t-r}(w*v) = o^{\mathcal{Y}}_{t-r}(w) o_0(v)$ for any $\mathcal{Y} \in \mathcal{I}\binom{F}{W\ U}$, where $o_0(v)$ denotes a grade preserving operator of v. If we set

$$O_n(W) = \{w \in W \mid o^{\mathcal{Y}}_{t-r}(w) = 0 \text{ for any } \mathcal{Y} \in \mathcal{I}\binom{F}{W\ U}, U, F \in \mathrm{Ind}(V)\}$$

where $\mathrm{Ind}(V)$ is the set of indecomposable V-modules in $\mathrm{mod}(V)$ and r and t are the lowest weights of U and F, respectively, then $A_n(V) = V/O_n(V)$ is an associative algebra and $A_n(W) = W/O_n(W)$ becomes an $A_n(V)$-bi-module.

[Proof of Proposition 7] We may assume that W and U are indecomposable. Since the actions of V shift the weights by integers, there are $r, s \in \mathbb{C}$ such that $W = \oplus_{n=0}^{\infty} W_{n+s}$ and $U = \oplus_{n=0}^{\infty} U_{n+r}$. Let $(\mathcal{Y}, F) \in \mathcal{F}(W,U)$ with $\mathcal{Y}(w,z) = \sum_{i=0}^{K} \sum_{m} w_{(i,m)} z^{-m-1} \log^i z$. We will show that the lengths of composition series of F have an upper bound. Since $\dim A_0(V) < \infty$, there are only finitely many conformal weights and so we assume $F = \oplus_{n=0}^{\infty} F_{n+t}$ with a lowest weight t. Moreover, for a sufficiently large N, a composition series of F as a V-module corresponds to a composition series of F_{N+t} as an $A_N(V)$-module. Since $\mathcal{Y}$ is surjective, we have

$$\langle w_{(i,\mathrm{wt}(w)-1-N+n+r-t)}(U_{n+r}) \mid w \in W, n \in \mathbb{N}, i = 0, \dots, K \rangle_{\mathbb{C}} = F_{N+t}.$$

As we did in the explanation of an N-th Zhu algebra, we have

$$\langle w_{(i,\mathrm{wt}(w)-1+r-t)}(U_{N+r}) \mid w \in W, i = 0, \ldots, K\rangle_{\mathbb{C}} = F_{N+t}.$$

We have to note that for $w_{(i,m)}$ with $i \neq 0$, we are able to choose another $\widetilde{\mathcal{Y}}$ such that $\widetilde{\mathcal{Y}}^{(0)} = \mathcal{Y}^{(i)}$ as we mentioned at (2.3). Therefore, there is a surjection

$$\phi : \coprod_{h=0}^{K} (A_N(W) \otimes U_{N+r}) \to F_{N+r}$$

given by $\phi(\coprod_{h=0}^{K}(w^{(h)} \otimes u^{(h)})) = \sum_{h=0}^{K} w^{(h)}_{(h,\mathrm{wt}(w^{(h)})-1+r-t)}u^{(h)}$ and so we have

$$\dim T_{N+r} \leq \dim A_N(W) \times \dim U_{N+r} \times (K+1).$$

The right hand side does not depend on the choice of F. Therefore, $\mathcal{F}(W,U)/(\cong)$ has a unique maximal element, which is a fusion product. ∎

We next explain about induced homomorphisms among fusion products. For a homomorphism $\phi : A \to B$ of V-modules, a formal operator $\mathcal{Y} \in \mathcal{I}\binom{B\boxtimes D}{A\ D}$ defined by

$$\mathcal{Y}(a,z)d = \mathcal{Y}^{\boxtimes}_{B,D}(\phi(a),z)d$$

becomes an intertwining operator of type $\binom{B\boxtimes D}{A\quad D}$. Therefore, by the maximality of fusion products, there is a V-homomorphism $\phi \boxtimes \mathrm{id}_D : A \boxtimes D \to B \boxtimes D$ such that

$$\phi \boxtimes \mathrm{id}_D \cdot (\mathcal{Y}(a,z)d) = \mathcal{Y}(\phi(a),z)d.$$

Similarly, we can define $\mathrm{id}_D \boxtimes \phi : D \boxtimes A \to D \boxtimes B$. The following shows that fusion products preserve the right exactness of sequences.

Proposition 8 *Let $A, B, C, D \in \mathrm{mod}(V)$. If*

$$A \overset{\phi}{\to} B \overset{\sigma}{\to} C \to 0$$

is exact, then so is

$$A \boxtimes D \xrightarrow{\phi\boxtimes\mathrm{id}_D} B \boxtimes D \xrightarrow{\sigma\boxtimes\mathrm{id}_D} C \boxtimes D \to 0.$$

[**Proof**] Clearly, $(\sigma \boxtimes \mathrm{id}_D) \cdot (\phi \boxtimes \mathrm{id}_D) = (\sigma \cdot \phi) \boxtimes \mathrm{id}_D = 0$. Since we may view $(\mathcal{Y}, F) \in \mathcal{F}(C,D)$ as $(\mathcal{Y}(\sigma), F) \in \mathcal{F}(B,D)$, $\sigma \boxtimes \mathrm{id}_D$ is surjective and so we may view $(C \boxtimes D)' \subseteq (B \boxtimes D)'$. We may also assume $A \subseteq B$ and $C = B/A$. Consider a canonical bilinear pairing

$$\langle w, \mathcal{Y}^{\boxtimes}_{B,D}(b,z)d\rangle \in \mathbb{C}\{z\}[\log z]$$

for $w \in (B \boxtimes D)', b \in B$ and $d \in D$. Clearly, if $w \in (C \boxtimes D)'$, then

$$\langle w, \mathcal{Y}^{\boxtimes}_{B,D}(a,z)d\rangle = 0 \tag{3.2}$$

for any $a \in A$. On the other hand, if $w \in (B \boxtimes D)'$ satisfies (3.2) for all $a \in A$, then $\langle w, \mathcal{Y}^{\boxtimes}_{B,D}(b,z)d\rangle$ is well defined for $b \in B/A = C$. Therefore,

$$0 \to (C \boxtimes D)' \to (B \boxtimes D)' \to (A \boxtimes D)'$$

is exact, which implies that $\boxtimes D$ preserves the right exactness. ∎

4 Projective covers

Let us start with an explanation of projective modules and projective covers.

Definition 9 *A V-module $P \in \mathrm{mod}(V)$ is called "projective" if every V-epimorphism $f : W \to P$ splits for $W \in \mathrm{mod}(V)$. If $P \to D$ is a cover and P is projective, we call P a "projective cover" of D.*

Different from an ordinary ring theory, V is not necessarily projective as a V-module.

Proposition 10 *Let V be a VOA and $D, U \in \mathrm{mod}(V)$. Then we have:*
(1) If $D \in \mathrm{mod}(V)$ is not projective, then there is a proper covering $F \overset{\beta}{\to} D$.
(2) If $\dim A_n(V) < \infty$ for any n, then every $U \in \mathrm{mod}(V)$ has a projective cover.

[**Proof**] Proof of (1). Since D is not projective, there is a non-split surjection $\beta : F \to D$. We choose F minimal among such non-split extensions. Clearly, F is a covering. Proof of (2). Since U is finitely generated, there are $u^{(1)}, \ldots, u^{(k)}$ in U such that $U = Vu^{(1)} + \cdots + Vu^{(k)}$, where $Vu = \{v_m u \mid v \in V, m \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ denotes a submodule generated from u by [4]. We may assume that $u^{(i)}$ are all homogeneous with the same weight, say r. Let $D \overset{\alpha}{\to} U$ be a covering of U. Since $\dim A_0(V) < \infty$, the number of irreducible V-modules is finite and so there is an integer N which does not depend on D such that the conformal weight of D is greater than $r - N$. Choose homogeneous elements $d^{(i)} \in D$ so that $\alpha(d^{(i)}) = u^{(i)}$ for every i. Since α is a covering, $D = Vd^{(1)} + \cdots + Vd^{(k)}$. Then the subspace D_r of D of weight r is spanned by $\{o(v)d^{(i)} \mid v \in V, i = 1, ..., k\}$ and so $\dim D_r \le k \dim A_N(V)$. Thus, the length of composition series of coverings of U is bounded and so U has a projective cover by (1). ▮

4.1 Principal projective cover and fusion products

In this subsection, we will prove the following:

Theorem 11 *Let V be a VOA and $\rho : P \to V$ a covering of V. Then for $W \in \mathrm{mod}(V)$,*

$$0 \to \mathrm{Ker}(\rho) \boxtimes W \xrightarrow{\epsilon \boxtimes \mathrm{id}_W} P \boxtimes W \xrightarrow{\rho \boxtimes \mathrm{id}_W} V \boxtimes W \to 0 \tag{4.1}$$

is exact if the weights of $\mathrm{Ker}(\rho) \boxtimes W$ are bounded below, where $\epsilon : \mathrm{Ker}(\rho) \to P$ is an embedding.

Before we start the proof, we will prove the following lemma:

Lemma 12 *Let $\rho : P \to V$ be a covering of V and $p \in P$ a homogeneous element satisfying $\rho(p) = \mathbf{1}$. Then*

$$\mathrm{Ker}(\rho) = \langle v_n p \in P \mid v \in V, n \ge 0 \rangle_{\mathbb{C}}. \tag{4.2}$$

[**Proof**] Since

$$Q=\langle v_np \mid v\in V, n\in\mathbb{Z}\rangle_{\mathbb{C}}$$

is a submodule of P by [4] and $\rho(Q)=V$, we have $Q=P$. Furthermore, since $(L(-1)v)_mp=-mv_{m-1}p$, we have

$$P=\langle v_np \mid v\in V, n\geq -1\rangle_{\mathbb{C}}=\langle v_{-1}p \mid v\in V\rangle_{\mathbb{C}}+\langle v_mp \mid v\in V, m\in\mathbb{N}\rangle_{\mathbb{C}}.$$

Since $\rho:\langle v_{-1}p \mid v\in V\rangle_{\mathbb{C}}\to\langle v_{-1}\mathbf{1} \mid v\in V\rangle$ is an injection and $\rho(\langle v_mp \mid v\in V, m\in\mathbb{N}\rangle_{\mathbb{C}})=\langle v_m\mathbf{1} \mid v\in V, m\in\mathbb{N}\rangle_{\mathbb{C}}=0$, we have the desired result. ∎

Let us start the proof of Theorem 11.

[**Proof of Theorem 11**] Set $Q=\mathrm{Ker}(\rho)$ and $\epsilon: Q\to P$ denotes an embedding. By Proposition 8, it is sufficient to show that $\epsilon\boxtimes\mathrm{id}_W: Q\boxtimes W\to P\boxtimes W$ is an injection. Let $\mathcal{Y}^{\boxtimes}_{Q,W}(a,z)=\sum_{j=0}^{K}\sum_m a_{(j,m)}z^{-m-1}\log^j z$ be a fusion product intertwining operator. Set $I=\mathcal{Y}^{(0)}$, that is, $I(a,z)=\sum_{r\in\mathbb{C}}a_{(0,r)}z^{-r-1}$ and we denote $a_{(0,r)}$ by a^I_r. We note that $I(*,z)$ is an $(z\frac{d}{dz}-L(-1)z)$-nilpotent intertwining operator as we showed at (2.2).

We choose a homogeneous element $p\in P$ satisfying $\rho(p)=\mathbf{1}$. Consider a vector space

$$R=p_{-1}W\oplus(Q\boxtimes W),$$

where $p_{-1}w$ is a formal element and $p_{-1}W=\{p_{-1}w \mid w\in W\}$. We view $Q\boxtimes W$ as a V-submodule of R and define a V-module structure on R. Define an action v^R_n of v on $R=p_{-1}W\oplus Q\boxtimes W$ by

$$v^R_n(p_{-1}w)=p_{-1}(v_nw)+\sum_{i=0}^{\infty}\binom{n}{i}(v_ip)^I_{-1+n-i}w.$$

We note that since $v_ip\in Q$ for $i\geq 0$, v^R_n is well-defined. By the direct calculations, we have $L(-1)$-Derivation:

$$\begin{aligned}(\omega_0v)^R_n(p_{-1}w)=&\ p_{-1}((\omega_0v)_nw)+\sum_{i=0}^{\infty}((\omega_0v)_ip)^I_{-1+n-i}w\\ =&\ -np_{-1}(v_{n-1}w)+\sum_{i=0}^{\infty}\binom{n}{i}(-iv_{i-1}p)^I_{-1+n-i}w=-nv^R_{n-1}(p_{-1}w).\end{aligned}\tag{4.3}$$

We also have Commutativity:

$$
\begin{aligned}
&(v_m^R u_n^R - u_n^R v_m^R)(p_{-1}w) \\
&= p_{-1}((v_m u_n - u_n v_m)w) + \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \binom{m}{i} (v_i p)_{m-1-i}^I * u_n w - \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \binom{n}{i} (v_i p)_{m-1-i}^I u_n w \\
&\qquad + \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \binom{n}{i} (u_i p)_{n-1-i}^I v_m w - \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \binom{n}{i} (u_i p)_{n-1-i}^I v_m w \\
&\qquad + \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \binom{n}{i} \binom{m}{j} (v_j u_i p)_{m+n-1-i-j}^I w - \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \binom{m}{j} \binom{n}{i} (u_i v_j p)_{m+n-1-i-j}^I w \\
&= p_{-1}([v_m, u_n]w) + \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \binom{n}{i} \binom{m}{j} ([v_i, u_j]p)_{m+n-1-i-j}^I w \\
&= p_{-1}([v_m, u_n]w) + \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \binom{n}{i} \binom{m}{j} \binom{i}{k} ((v_k u)_{i+j-k} p)_{m+n-1-i-j}^I w \\
&= p_{-1}(\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \binom{m}{j} (v_j u)_{m+n-j}^I w) + \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \binom{m}{j} \binom{n+m-j}{i} ((v_j u)_i p)_{m+n-1-j-i}^I w \\
&= \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \binom{m}{j} (v_j u)_{m+n-j}^R (p_{-1}w). \qquad (4.4)
\end{aligned}
$$

By solving $(v_n u)_r$ from Commutativity for $n \geq 0$, we have Associativity:

$$
\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \binom{n}{i} (-1)^i \{ v_{n-i}^R u_{m+i}^R - (-1)^n u_{m+n-i}^R v_i^R \} = (v_n u)_m^R \quad \text{for } n \geq 0. \qquad (4.5)
$$

For $m \in \mathbb{Z}$, we also have:

$$
\begin{aligned}
&(v_n u)_m^R (p_{-1}t) - p_{-1}(v_n u)_m w = \sum_{i=0}^{m} \binom{m}{i} ((v_n u)_i p)_{m-1-i}^I w \\
&= \sum_{i\in\mathbb{N}} \sum_{j\in\mathbb{N}} \binom{m}{i} \binom{n}{j} (-1)^j (\{ v_{n-j} u_{i+j} p - (-1)^n u_{n+i-j} v_j p \})_{m-1-1}^I w \\
&= \sum_{i\in\mathbb{N}} \sum_{j\in\mathbb{N}} \sum_{h\in\mathbb{N}} \binom{m}{i} \binom{n}{j} (-1)^{j+h} \binom{n-j}{h} v_{n-j-h} (u_{i+j} p)_{m-i-1+h}^I w \\
&\qquad - \sum_{i\in\mathbb{N}} \sum_{j\in\mathbb{N}} \sum_{h\in\mathbb{N}} (-1)^{n+h} \binom{m}{i} \binom{n}{j} \binom{n-j}{h} (u_{i+j} p)_{m-1+n-i-j-h}^I v_h w \\
&\qquad + \sum_{i\in\mathbb{N}} \sum_{j\in\mathbb{N}} \sum_{h\in\mathbb{N}} (-1)^{j+n+1+h} \binom{m}{i} \binom{n}{j} \binom{n+i-j}{h} u_{n+i-j-h} (v_j p)_{m-i-1+h}^I w \\
&\qquad + \sum_{i,j,h\in\mathbb{N}} (-1)^{i+h} \binom{m}{i} \binom{n}{j} \binom{n+i-j}{h} (v_j p)_{n+m-j-1-h}^I u_h w \\
&= \sum_{i,j,h\in\mathbb{N}} \binom{m}{i} \binom{n}{j} (-1)^{j+h} \binom{n-j}{h} \{ A^{n-j-h} B^{i+j} - (-1)^{n-j+1} C^{i+j} D^h \} \\
&\qquad + \sum_{i,j,h\in\mathbb{N}} \binom{m}{i} (-1)^{j+n+1+h} \binom{n}{j} \binom{n+i-j}{h} \{ E^{n+i-j-h} F^j - (-1)^{n+i-j} G^j H^h \} \\
&= (1+B)^m (A-1-B)^n - (1+C)^m (-1+D-C)^n \\
&\qquad - (1+E-1)^m (-E+1+F)^n + (1-1+H)^m (1-H+G)^n,
\end{aligned}
$$

where the monomials A^sB^k, B^sD^k, E^sF^k and G^sH^k in the last two polynomials denote $v_s(u_kp)^I_{m+n-s-k-1}w, (u_sp)^I_{m-1+n-s-k}v_kw, u_s(v_kp)^I_{m+n-k-s-1}w,$ and $(v_sp)^I_{n+m-s-1-k}u_kw,$ respectively. On the other hand, for n-th normal product $*_n$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
(v *_n u)^R_m(p_{-1}t) - p_{-1}(v_nu)_mw =&\sum_{h\in\mathbb{N}}\binom{n}{h}(-1)^h\{v_{n-h}u_{m+h} - (-1)^n u_{m+n-h}v_h\}(p_{-1}w)\\
=&\sum_{h\in\mathbb{N}}\binom{n}{h}(-1)^h\left\{v_{n-h}\binom{h+m}{j}(u_jp)^I_{m+h-1-j}w + \sum_{j\in\mathbb{N}}\binom{n-h}{j}(v_jp)^I_{n-h-1-j}u_{m+h}w\right\}\\
&+\sum_{h,j\in\mathbb{N}}\binom{n}{h}(-1)^{n+h+1}\left\{u_{m+n-h}\binom{h}{j}(v_jp)^I_{h-1-j}w + \binom{m+n-h}{j}(u_jp)^I_{n+m-h-j}v_hw\right\}\\
=&\sum_{h,j\in\mathbb{N}}\binom{n}{h}(-1)^h\binom{m+h}{j}A^{n-h}B^j + \sum_{h,j\in\mathbb{N}}\binom{n}{h}(-1)^{h+m+1}\binom{n+m-h}{j}G^jH^h\\
&+\sum_{h,j\in\mathbb{N}}\binom{n}{h}(-1)^{n+h+1}\binom{h}{j}E^{n+m-h}F^j + \sum_{h,j\in\mathbb{N}}\binom{n}{h}(-1)^h\binom{n-h}{j}C^jD^{m+h}\\
=&(1+B)^m(A-1-B)^n + H^m(1+G-H)^n - E^m(-E+1+F)^n\\
&-(1+C)^m(-1-C+D)^n.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we have another Associativity

$$(v *_n u)^R_m r = (v_nu)^R_m r \quad \text{for } m \geq 0 \tag{4.6}$$

for $r \in R$. The remaining Associativity we have to prove is the case for $m < 0$ and $n < 0$, but we will not prove it directly. Fortunately, the results above are enough to prove that R is a V-module as we will see. Since the weight of R is bounded below,

$$\overline{V} := \{v^R(z) = \sum_{h\in\mathbb{Z}} v^R_h z^{-h-1} \mid v \in V\}$$

satisfy the lower truncation property and so they are quantum operators (or called weak vertex operators). Furthermore they are mutually commutative because of (4.4) and so they generate a local system $\widetilde{V}$ in $\mathrm{End}(R)[[z, z^{-1}]]$ by using normal products $*_n$. Since $\omega^R(z)$ is also a Virasoro element of $\widetilde{V}$, $\widetilde{V}$ is a vertex algebra with the same grading on $\bar{V}$, that is, $\omega^R(z) *_1 v^R(z) = \mathrm{wt}(v)v^R(z)$ by (4.5). By viewing n-th normal products in $\widetilde{V}$ as n-th products in V, we have a vertex algebra epimorphism $\psi : \widetilde{V} \to V$. Since $\widetilde{V}$ stabilizes

$$0 \subseteq Q \boxtimes W \subseteq R,$$

we have $(\mathrm{Ker}(\psi))^2 = 0$ and so $\mathrm{Ker}(\psi)$ is a V-module. Suppose $\widetilde{V} \neq \overline{V}$, then

$$\mathcal{F} = \{v^R(z) *_n u^R(z) - (v_nu)^R(z) \mid v, u \in V\} \neq 0$$

Since $v^R(z) *_n u^R(z) = (v_nu)^R(z)$ for $n \geq 0$ by (4.5), the weights of elements in $\mathcal{F}$ have a lower bound. Choose $0 \neq \alpha(z) = v^R(z)_n * u^R(z) - (v_nu)^R(z) \in \mathcal{F}$ so that $\alpha(z)$ has minimal weight among them. Since $\omega^R(z) *_k v^R(z) = (\omega_kv)^R(z)$ for $k \geq 0$, $\omega^R(z) *_k \alpha(z)$ is a linear sum of elements in $\mathcal{F}$ and so $\omega^R(z) *_k (\alpha(z)) = 0$ for $k \geq 2$ because of the minimality of $\mathrm{wt}(\alpha(z))$. For $m \geq 0$, since $\alpha(z)_m = 0$ on R by (4.6), we have:

$0 = [\omega^R(z)_k, \alpha(z)_m] = (\omega_0\alpha(z))_{k+m} + k(\mathrm{wt}(\alpha))\alpha(z)_{k+m-1} = (-k-m+k(\mathrm{wt}(\alpha)))\alpha(z)_{k+m-1}$

for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ and so $\alpha(z)_h = 0$ for any h, which contradict to $\alpha(z) \neq 0$. Therefore, $\widetilde{V} = V$ and we know that R is a V-module.

The remaining thing we have to prove is to define an $(z\frac{d}{dz} - L(-1)z)$-nilpotent intertwining operator $\mathcal{Y}^0$ of type $\binom{R}{P\ W}$. It is natural to expect that $\mathcal{Y}^0$ satisfies $\frac{d}{dz}\mathcal{Y}^0(q,z) = I(\omega_0 q, z)$. However, a coefficient $(L(-1)p)^I_0$ of $I(L(-1)q,z)$ at z^{-1} may not be zero whereas $\frac{d}{dz}\mathcal{Y}^0(w,z)$ does not have z^{-1}-term. Fortunately, we have that for any $v \in V, n \in \mathbb{Z}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
v^R_n(L(-1)p)^I_0 - (L(-1)p)^I_0 v^R_n =& \sum_{i=0}^{\infty}\binom{n}{i}(v^P_i L(-1)p)^I_{n-i} \\
=& \sum_{i=0}^{\infty}\binom{n}{i}\{(L(-1)v^P_i p)^I_{n-i} + (iv^P_{i-1}p)^I_{n-i}\} = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty}\binom{n}{i}\{(-n+i)(v^P_i p)^I_{n-i-1} + (iv^P_{i-1}p)^I_{n-i}\} \\
=& -n\sum_{i=0}^{\infty}\binom{n-1}{i}(v^P_i p)^I_{n-i-1} + \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} n\binom{n-1}{i-1}(v^P_{i-1}p)^I_{n-i} = 0
\end{aligned}$$

and so $(L(-1)p)^I_0$ is a V-homomorphism. We now set

$$\begin{aligned}
p(z)w :=& \left\{\int I(L(-1)p,z) - (L(-1)p)^I_0 z^{-1})dz\right\} w + p_{-1}w \qquad \text{for } w \in W \\
=& \sum_{m\in\mathbb{Z}, m\neq 0} \frac{1}{-m}(L(-1)p)^I_m z^{-m} w + p_{-1}w \qquad (4.7) \\
p(z)r :=& \{I(p,z) - (L(-1)p)^I_0 z^{-1}\}r \qquad \text{for } r \in Q \boxtimes U.
\end{aligned}$$

Let us show that $p(z)$ satisfies Commutativity with respect to all actions $a(z)$ of $a \in V$. By direct calculation, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
[a(z),p(x)] - \sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}}\sum_{i=0}^{\infty}\binom{n}{i}(a_i p)^I_{n-1-i} z^{-n-1} =& \sum_{m\neq 0, n\in\mathbb{Z}} [a_n z^{-n-1}, (L(-1)p)^I_m \frac{-1}{m} x^{-m}] \\
=& \sum_{m\neq 0, n\in\mathbb{Z}}\sum_{i=0}^{\infty}\binom{n}{i}(a_i L(-1)p)^I_{m+n-i}\frac{-1}{m}x^{-m}z^{-n-1} \\
=& \sum_{m\neq 0, n\in\mathbb{Z}}\sum_{i=0}^{\infty}\binom{n}{i}\{(L(-1)a_i p)^I_{m+n-i} + i(a_{i-1}p)^I_{m+n-i}\}\frac{-1}{m}x^{-m}z^{-n-1} \\
=& \sum_{m\neq 0, n\in\mathbb{Z}}\sum_{i=0}^{\infty}\binom{n}{i}\{(-m-n+i)(a_i p)^I_{m+n-i-1} + i(a_{i-1}p)^I_{m+n-i}\}\frac{-1}{m}x^{-m}z^{-n-1} \\
=& \sum_{m\neq 0, n\in\mathbb{Z}}\sum_{i=0}^{\infty}\binom{n}{i}(-m)(a_i p)^I_{m+n-i-1}\frac{-1}{m}x^{-m}z^{-n-1} \\
=& \sum_{m\neq 0, n\in\mathbb{Z}}\sum_{i=0}^{\infty}\binom{n}{i}(a_i p)^I_{m+n-i-1}x^{-m}z^{-n-1},
\end{aligned}$$

and so

$$[a(z),p(x)] = \sum_{m,n\in\mathbb{Z}}\sum_{i\in\mathbb{N}}\binom{n}{i}(a_i p)^I_{(m+n-i-1)}x^{-m}z^{-n-1}.$$

Since the weights of R are bounded below, there is N such that $a_i p = 0$ for $i \geq N$ and so we have Commutativity:

$$(x-z)^{N+1}[a(z),p(x)] = (x-z)^{N+1}(\sum_{i=0}^{N}\sum_{r\in\mathbb{Z}}(a_i p)^I_{r-i-1}\sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}}\binom{n}{i}x^{n-r}z^{-n-1}) = 0.$$

We then extend it by

$$\mathcal{Y}^0(v_np,z)=\mathrm{Res}_x\{(x-z)^nv(x)p(z)-(-z+x)^np(z)v(x)\}$$

for $v\in V, n\in\mathbb{Z}$, then $\mathcal{Y}^0$ is a $(z\frac{d}{dz}-L(-1)z)$-nilpotent intertwining operator and so

$$\mathcal{Y}(u,z)=\sum_{i=0}^{K}\frac{1}{i!}(zL(-1)-z\frac{d}{dz})^i\mathcal{Y}^0(u,z)\log^i z \qquad \text{for } u\in P$$

is an intertwining operator of P from W to R. Since $CY(u,z)=\mathcal{Y}^{\boxtimes}_{\mathrm{Ker}(\rho),U}(u,z)$ for $u\in\mathrm{Ker}(\rho)$, the space spanned by images of $\mathcal{Y}$ contains $Q\boxtimes U$. Furthermore, since $\mathcal{Y}(q,z)w\in p_{-1}w+Q\boxtimes U$, we get that $\mathcal{Y}$ is surjective.

This completes the proof of Theorem. ∎

As a corollary of Lemma 12, we have:

Theorem 13 *If a simple VOA V contains a rational subVOA W containing the same Virasoro element of V, then V is projective.*

[**Proof**] Suppose false and let $\rho : P\to V$ be a proper covering of V and choose $p\in P_0$ such that $\rho(p)=\mathbf{1}$. Viewing P as a W-module, P is a direct of irreducible W-modules. We may choose p in a simple W-submodule R. Then $\rho(R)=W$ and so R is isomorphic to W. Therefore $L(-1)p=0$. Since P is a V-module, for $v\in V$, there is $N_v\in\mathbb{N}$ such that $v_mp=0$ for $m\geq N_v$. Then since $0=L(-1)v_mp=-mv_{m-1}p$, we have $v_kp=0$ for $k\in\mathbb{N}$, which implies $\mathrm{Ker}(\rho)=0$ by (4.2) and we have a contradiction. ∎

4.2 Projective covers for semi-rigid modules

In this subsection, we will prove the following:

Theorem 14 *If C is a semi-rigid irreducible module and $D\overset{\alpha}{\to}C$ is a covering of C, then there is a covering $R\overset{\rho}{\to}V$ such that D is a homomorphic image of $R\boxtimes D$. In particular, if V has a projective cover P_V and $P_V\boxtimes C$ is finitely generated, then C has a projective cover P_C which is isomorphic to a direct summand of $P_V\boxtimes C$.*

[**Proof**] Since C is semi-rigid, we have the following epimorphism:

$$C\boxtimes Q\xrightarrow{\mathrm{id}_C\boxtimes\epsilon}C\boxtimes(\widetilde{C}\boxtimes C)\xrightarrow{\mu_C}(C\boxtimes\widetilde{C})\boxtimes C\xrightarrow{e_C\boxtimes\mathrm{id}_C}C,$$

where $\epsilon : Q\to\widetilde{C}\boxtimes C$ is an embedding, $e_{\widetilde{C}}:\widetilde{C}\boxtimes C\to V$, $e_{\widetilde{C}}\epsilon : Q\to V$ is a covering and μ_C is a natural isomorphism for the associativity of products of intertwining operators, see (5.3). By the pull back of $D\overset{\alpha}{\to}C$, we may choose an isomorphism μ_D such that we have the following commutative diagram:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
 & C\boxtimes(\widetilde{C}\boxtimes D) \arrow[r, "\mu_D"] \arrow[d, "\mathrm{id}_C\boxtimes(\mathrm{id}_{\widetilde{C}}\boxtimes\alpha)"] & (C\boxtimes\widetilde{C})\boxtimes D \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "\mathrm{id}_{C\boxtimes\widetilde{C}}\boxtimes\alpha"] & D \arrow[d, "\alpha"] \\
C\boxtimes Q \arrow[r] & C\boxtimes(\widetilde{C}\boxtimes C) \arrow[r, "\mu_C"] & (C\boxtimes\widetilde{C})\boxtimes C \arrow[r] & C.
\end{tikzcd}$$

Let R be a minimal submodule of $\widetilde{C}\boxtimes D$ with respect to inclusion such that $(\mathrm{id}_{\widetilde{C}}\boxtimes\alpha)(R)=Q$. Then since $D\overset{\alpha}{\to}C$ is a covering and $(e_W\boxtimes\mathrm{id}_C)\mu_C(\mathrm{id}_C\boxtimes\alpha)(\mathrm{id}_C\boxtimes\epsilon_R)(C\boxtimes R)=C$, we have $(e_W\boxtimes\mathrm{id}_D)\mu_D(\mathrm{id}_C\boxtimes\epsilon_R)(C\boxtimes R)=D$ and so D is a homomorphic image of $C\boxtimes R$. By the choice of R, $e_{\widetilde{C}}(\mathrm{id}_{\widetilde{C}}\boxtimes\alpha):R\to V$ is a covering of V, which proves the first statement in the theorem.

If V has a projective cover P_V and $P_V\boxtimes C$ has a finite length of composition series, then any covering D of C is a homomorphic image of $P_V\boxtimes C$ and so the length of composition series of D has an upper bound. Therefore, a covering of C has a maximal one, which is projective by Proposition 10 and isomorphic to a direct summand of $P_V\boxtimes C$.

This completes the proof of Theorem 14. ∎

We easily have the following corollary.

Corollary 15 *If V is projective as a V-module, then every semi-rigid irreducible module is projective.*

Theorem 16 *Let V be a C_2-cofinite VOA of CFT-type and C a semi-rigid V-module. Then*

$$0\to\mathrm{Ker}(\rho_C)\boxtimes W\xrightarrow{\epsilon\boxtimes\mathrm{id}_W}P_C\boxtimes W\xrightarrow{\rho_C\boxtimes\mathrm{id}_W}C\boxtimes W\to 0 \tag{4.8}$$

is exact, where $0\to\mathrm{Ker}(\rho_C)\overset{\epsilon}{\to}P_C\xrightarrow{\rho_C}C\to 0$ is a projective cover of C.

[**Proof**] Since V is C_2-cofinite, all fusion products are finitely generated and the products of intertwining operators satisfy Associativity. Let $\rho_V:P_V\to V$ be a projective cover of V. By Theorem 14, there is a surjection $\alpha:P_V\boxtimes C\to P_C$. Set $J=\mathrm{Ker}(\alpha)$. Since $C\in\mathrm{mod}(V)$, we have the following commutative exact diagram by (4.1):

$$\begin{tikzcd}
0 \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & J \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & J \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & 0 \arrow[d] & \\
0 \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & \mathrm{Ker}(\rho_V)\boxtimes C \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & P_V\boxtimes C \arrow[r, "\rho_V\boxtimes\mathrm{id}_C"] \arrow[d, "\alpha"] & V\boxtimes C=C \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & 0 \arrow[d] \\
0 \arrow[r] & \mathrm{Ker}(\rho_C) \arrow[r, "\epsilon"] \arrow[d] & D \arrow[r, "\rho_C"] \arrow[d] & C \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & 0 \\
 & 0 \arrow[r] & 0 \arrow[r] & 0 &
\end{tikzcd}$$

From Theorem 11, we also have an exact sequence

$$0\to\mathrm{Ker}(\rho_V)\boxtimes(C\boxtimes W)\to P_V\boxtimes(C\boxtimes W)\to C\boxtimes W\to 0.$$

Since the fusion products satisfy the associativity and preserve the right exactness, we have an exact sequence:

$$0\to(\mathrm{Ker}(\rho_V)\boxtimes C)\boxtimes W\to(P_V\boxtimes C)\boxtimes W\to C\boxtimes W\to 0.$$

Again, since $\boxtimes W$ preserves the right exactness, we have the commutative exact diagram:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
0 \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & J\boxtimes W \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "\sigma_1"'] & J\boxtimes W \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "\sigma_2"'] & 0 \arrow[d] & \\
0 \arrow[r] & (\mathrm{Ker}(\rho_V)\boxtimes C)\boxtimes W \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & (P_V\boxtimes C)\boxtimes W \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & C\boxtimes W \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & 0 \arrow[d] \\
 & \mathrm{Ker}(\rho_C)\boxtimes W \arrow[r, "\epsilon\boxtimes\mathrm{id}_W"] \arrow[d] & D\boxtimes W \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & C\boxtimes W \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & 0 \\
 & 0 \arrow[r] & 0 \arrow[r] & 0, &
\end{tikzcd}$$

which implies that $\epsilon \boxtimes \mathrm{id}_W$ is injective.

This completes the proof of Theorem 16. ∎

Since $V \boxtimes W \cong W$, the following easily comes from Theorem 14.

Corollary 17 *Let V be a simple C_2-cofinite VOA of CFT-type and assume that all V-modules are semi-rigid. If V is projective as a V-module, then all V-modules are projective. In particular, V is rational.*

5 Products of intertwining operators

5.1 Fusion products

In this section, we assume that the desired products of intertwining operators satisfy the associativity and the desired fusion products are well-defined as V-modules. The aim in this section is to use homomorphisms and fusion product intertwining operators to present products of intertwining operators.

We first recall the analytic part on the composition of intertwining operators (with logarithmic terms) from [10]. From now on, let $\{A, B, C, D, E, F\}$ be a set of C_1-cofinite V-modules. We choose $a \in A, b \in B, c \in C, d' \in D'$. As Huang showed, for intertwining operators $\mathcal{Y}_1 \in \mathcal{I}\binom{D}{A\;E}$, $\mathcal{Y}_2 \in \mathcal{I}\binom{E}{B\;C}$, $\mathcal{Y}_3 \in \mathcal{I}\binom{D}{F\;C}$ and $\mathcal{Y}_4 \in \mathcal{I}\binom{F}{A\;B}$, the formal power series (with logarithmic terms)

$$\langle d', \mathcal{Y}_1(a,x)\mathcal{Y}_2(b,y)c\rangle \quad \text{and} \quad \langle d', \mathcal{Y}_3(\mathcal{Y}_4(a,x-y)b,y)c\rangle$$

are absolutely convergent in $\Delta_1 = \{(x,y) \in \mathbb{C}^2 \mid |x| > |y| > 0\}$ and $\Delta_2 = \{(x,y) \in \mathbb{C}^2 \mid |y| > |x-y| > 0\}$, respectively, and can all be analytically extended to multi-valued analytic functions on

$$M^2 = \{(x,y) \in \mathbb{C}^2 \mid xy(x-y) \neq 0\}.$$

As he did, we are able to lift them to single-valued analytic functions

$$E(\langle d, \mathcal{Y}_1(a,x)\mathcal{Y}_2(b,y)c\rangle) \quad \text{and} \quad E(\langle d, \mathcal{Y}_3(\mathcal{Y}_4(a,x-y)b,y)c\rangle) \tag{5.1}$$

on the universal covering $\widetilde{M^2}$ of M^2. Single-valued liftings are not unique as he remarked, but the existence of such functions is enough for our arguments. The important fact is that if we fix A, B, C, D, then these functions are given as solutions of the same differential equations. Therefore, for $\mathcal{Y}_1 \in \mathcal{I}\binom{D}{A\;E}, \mathcal{Y}_2 \in \mathcal{I}\binom{E}{B\;C}$ there are $\mathcal{Y}_5 \in \mathcal{I}\binom{D}{A\boxtimes B\;C}$ and $\mathcal{Y}_6 \in \mathcal{I}\binom{D}{B\;A\boxtimes C}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} E(\langle d', \mathcal{Y}_1(a,x)\mathcal{Y}_2(b,y)c\rangle) &= E(\langle d', \mathcal{Y}_5(\mathcal{Y}^{\boxtimes}_{A,B}(a,x-y)b,y)c\rangle) \quad \text{and} \\ E(\langle d', \mathcal{Y}_2(\mathcal{Y}_4(a,x-y)b,y)c\rangle) &= E(\langle d', \mathcal{Y}_6(a,x)\mathcal{Y}^{\boxtimes}_{B,C}(b,y)c\rangle). \end{aligned} \tag{5.2}$$

We note that the right hand sides of (5.2) are usually expressed as linear sums, say,

$$E(\langle d', \mathcal{Y}_1(a,x)\mathcal{Y}_2(b,y)c\rangle) = \sum_i E(\langle d', \mathcal{Y}_{1i}(\mathcal{Y}_{2i}(a,x-y)b,y)c\rangle).$$

However, for each i, from the maximality of fusion products, there is a homomorphism $\xi_i \in \mathrm{Hom}_V(A\boxtimes B, \mathrm{Im}(\mathcal{Y}_{2i}))$ such that $\mathcal{Y}_{2i} = \xi_i \mathcal{Y}^{\boxtimes}_{A,B}$. Since $\mathcal{Y}_5 := \sum_i \mathcal{Y}_{1i}\xi_i$ is an intertwining operator in $\mathcal{I}\binom{D}{A\boxtimes B\;C}$, we get the expressions (5.2). For example, a natural isomorphism $\mu : (A \boxtimes B) \boxtimes C \to A \boxtimes (B \boxtimes C)$ is given by

$$E(\langle d', \mu\mathcal{Y}^{\boxtimes}_{A\boxtimes B,C}(\mathcal{Y}^{\boxtimes}_{A,B}(a, x-y)b, y)c\rangle) = E(\langle d', \mathcal{Y}^{\boxtimes}_{A,B\boxtimes C}(a, x)\mathcal{Y}^{\boxtimes}_{B,C}(b, y)c\rangle). \tag{5.3}$$

In order to simplify the notation, we often use the notations $\mathcal{Y}_1\mathcal{Y}_2$ and $\mathcal{Y}_3(\mathcal{Y}_4)$ to distinguish two types $\mathcal{Y}_1(*, x)\mathcal{Y}_2(*, y)$ and $\mathcal{Y}_3(\mathcal{Y}_4(*, x)*, y)$, respectively.

5.2 Skew symmetric and adjoint intertwining operators

In his paper [11], Huang has explicitly defined a skew symmetry intertwining operator $\sigma_{12}(\mathcal{Y}) \in \mathcal{I}\binom{C}{B,A}$ and an adjoint intertwining operator $\sigma_{23}(\mathcal{Y}) \in \mathcal{I}\binom{B'}{A\;C'}$ for $\mathcal{Y} \in \mathcal{I}\binom{C}{A\;B}$ when $\mathcal{Y}$ has no logarithmic terms. Even if $\mathcal{Y} \in \mathcal{I}\binom{C}{B\;A}$ has logarithmic terms, there are isomorphisms $\sigma_{12} : \mathcal{I}\binom{C}{A\;B} \to \mathcal{I}\binom{C}{B\;A}$ and $\sigma_{23} : \mathcal{I}\binom{C}{A\;B} \to \mathcal{I}\binom{B'}{A\;C'}$ as follows. By considering a path $\{z = \frac{1}{2}e^{\pi i t}x \mid 0 \leq t \leq 1\}$, there is $\widetilde{\mathcal{Y}} \in \mathcal{I}\binom{C}{A\;B}$ such that

$$E(\langle c', \widetilde{\mathcal{Y}}(a, z)\sigma_{12}(Y^B)(b, x)\mathbf{1}\rangle) = E(\langle c', \mathcal{Y}(b, x)\sigma_{12}(Y^A)(a, z)\mathbf{1}\rangle). \tag{5.4}$$

Rewriting them, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{the left side of (5.4)} &= E(\langle c', \widetilde{\mathcal{Y}}(a, z)e^{L(-1)x}b\rangle) = E(\langle c', e^{L(-1)x}\widetilde{\mathcal{Y}}(a, z-x)b\rangle) \\
&= E(\langle e^{L(1)x}c', \widetilde{\mathcal{Y}}(a, z-x)b\rangle) \qquad \text{and} \\
\text{the right side of (5.4)} &= E(\langle c', \mathcal{Y}(b, x)e^{L(-1)(z)}a\rangle) = E(\langle c', e^{L(-1)z}\mathcal{Y}(b, x-z)a\rangle) \\
&= E(\langle e^{L(1)x}c', e^{L(-1)(z-x)}\mathcal{Y}(b, x-z)a\rangle).
\end{aligned}$$

Since $\langle e^{L(1)x}c', \widetilde{\mathcal{Y}}(a, z-x)b\rangle$ and $\langle e^{L(1)x}c', e^{L(-1)z}\mathcal{Y}(b, x-z)a\rangle$ are multivalued rational functions on $\{(x, z) \mid x \neq z\}$, we may choose σ_{12} so that $\sigma_{12}(\mathcal{Y}) = \widetilde{\mathcal{Y}}$, that is,

$$\sigma_{12}(\mathcal{Y})(a, z-x)b = e^{L(-1)(z-x)}\mathcal{Y}(b, x-z)a. \tag{5.5}$$

Similarly, for $\mathcal{Y} \in \mathcal{I}\binom{C'}{A\;B}$ and canonical intertwining operators $\mathcal{Y}^{V'}_{C,C'}$ and $\mathcal{Y}^{V'}_{B',B}$ induced from inner products, there is $\mathcal{Y}_4 \in \mathcal{I}\binom{B'}{A\;C}$ such that

$$E(\langle \mathbf{1}, \mathcal{Y}^{V'}_{C,C'}(c, x)\mathcal{Y}(a, y)b\rangle) = E(\langle \mathbf{1}, \mathcal{Y}^{V'}_{B',B}(e^{L(-1)(x-y)}\mathcal{Y}_4(a, y-x)c, y)b\rangle). \tag{5.6}$$

Therefore, a map $\mathcal{Y} \to \mathcal{Y}_4$ gives an isomorphism $\sigma_{23} : \mathcal{I}\binom{C}{A\;B} \cong \mathcal{I}\binom{B'}{A\;C'}$.

We don't get an explicit formula because what we will need is just an existence of isomorphism $\sigma_{23}(\mathcal{Y})$. Set $\sigma_{123} = \sigma_{12}\sigma_{23}$.

In (5.2), we used $\mathcal{Y}^{\boxtimes}$ as the second intertwining operator of products. Not only the second one, we can also use it for the first one at the same time. Actually, for $\mathcal{Y}_5(\mathcal{Y}^{\boxtimes}_{A,B})$ with $\mathcal{Y}_5 \in \mathcal{I}\binom{D}{A\boxtimes B\;C}$, we have $\sigma_{23}^{-1}\sigma_{12}^{-1}(\mathcal{Y}_5) \in \mathcal{I}\binom{(A\boxtimes B)'}{C\;D'}$ and so there is $\delta \in \mathrm{Hom}_V(C \boxtimes D', (A \boxtimes B)')$ such that $\sigma_{23}^{-1}\sigma_{12}^{-1}(\mathcal{Y}_5) = \delta\mathcal{Y}^{\boxtimes}_{C,D'}$. Therefore we have:

Proposition 18 *For any* $\mathcal{Y}_1 \in \mathcal{I}\binom{D}{A\;E}, \mathcal{Y}_2 \in \mathcal{I}\binom{E}{B\;C}$ *and* $\mathcal{Y}_3 \in \mathcal{I}\binom{E}{A\;B}, \mathcal{Y}_4 \in \mathcal{I}\binom{D}{E\;C}$*, there are* $\xi \in \mathrm{Hom}_V(B \boxtimes C, (A \boxtimes D')')$ *and* $\delta \in \mathrm{Hom}_V(B \boxtimes C, (C \boxtimes D')')$ *such that*

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle d', \mathcal{Y}_1(a, z_1)\mathcal{Y}_2(b, z_2)c\rangle &= \langle d', \sigma_{23}(\mathcal{Y}^{\boxtimes}_{A,D'})(a, z_1)\xi\mathcal{Y}^{\boxtimes}_{B,C}(b, z_2)c\rangle, \qquad \textit{and} \\
\langle d', \mathcal{Y}_4(\mathcal{Y}_3(a, z_1)b, z_2)c\rangle &= \langle d', \sigma_{123}(\mathcal{Y}^{\boxtimes}_{C,D'})(\delta\mathcal{Y}^{\boxtimes}_{A,B}(a, z_1)b, z_2)c\rangle,
\end{aligned} \tag{5.7}$$

for any $a \in A, b \in B, c \in C, d' \in D'$*. In other words, the space spanned by the products* $\mathcal{Y}_1\mathcal{Y}_2$ *of* $\mathcal{Y}_1 \in \mathcal{I}\binom{D}{A\;*}$ *and* $\mathcal{Y}_2 \in \mathcal{I}\binom{*}{B\;C}$ *is isomorphism to* $\mathrm{Hom}_V(B \boxtimes C, (A \boxtimes D')')$ *and the space spanned by the product* $\mathcal{Y}_3(\mathcal{Y}_4)$ *of* $\mathcal{Y}_3 \in \mathcal{I}\binom{*}{A\;B}$ *and* $\mathcal{Y}_4 \in \mathcal{I}\binom{D}{*\;C}$ *is isomorphism to* $\mathrm{Hom}_V(A \boxtimes B, (C \boxtimes D')')$.

5.3 Semi-rigidity and intertwining operators

The aim in this subsection is to describe the semi-rigidity in terms of intertwining operators. We assume that V is simple. For a V-module U, let $\mathrm{rad}^V(U)$ denote the intersection of maximal submodules M with $U/M \cong V$. Since V is simple, $U/\mathrm{rad}^V(U)$ is a direct sum of copies of V. Let W be a simple C_1-cofinite V-module and assume W is not semi-rigid. By the definition of semi-rigid, for any $\widetilde{W} \in \mathrm{mod}(V)$ satisfying (1) in Definition 1, $e_W \in \mathrm{Hom}_V(W \boxtimes \widetilde{W}, V)$ and a maximal submodule Q of $\widetilde{W} \boxtimes W$ containing $\mathrm{rad}^V(\widetilde{W} \boxtimes W)$, $(e_W \boxtimes \mathrm{id}_W)\mu(\mathrm{id}_W \boxtimes \epsilon)$ is not surjective, in other words,

$$(e_W \boxtimes \mathrm{id}_W)\mu(\mathrm{id}_W \boxtimes \epsilon)(W \boxtimes Q) \subseteq \mathrm{Ker}(e_W \boxtimes \mathrm{id}_W).$$

Since μ is isomorphism and W is simple, the above implies that

$$\mu((\mathrm{id}_W \boxtimes \epsilon)(W \boxtimes \mathrm{rad}^V(\widetilde{W} \boxtimes W))) + \mathrm{Ker}(e_W \boxtimes \mathrm{id}_W) = (W \boxtimes \widetilde{W}) \boxtimes W, \tag{5.8}$$

for any $e_W : W \boxtimes \widetilde{W} \to V$, where $\epsilon : \mathrm{rad}^V(\widetilde{W} \boxtimes W) \subseteq \widetilde{W} \boxtimes W$ is an embedding.

We then rewrite (1.1) by products of intertwining operator as follows: Since $e_{\widetilde{W}}\mathcal{Y}^{\boxtimes}_{\widetilde{W},W} \in \mathcal{I}\binom{V}{\widetilde{W},W}$, from (5.2) and (5.7), there are $\mathcal{Y}_5$ and $\delta \in \mathrm{Hom}_V(W \boxtimes \widetilde{W}, (W \boxtimes W')')$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} E(\langle a', \sigma_{12}(Y^W)(w,x)e_{\widetilde{W}}\mathcal{Y}^{\boxtimes}_{\widetilde{W},W}(\widetilde{w},y)w^1\rangle) &= E(\langle a', \mathcal{Y}_5(\mathcal{Y}^{\boxtimes}_{W,\widetilde{W}}(w,x-y)\widetilde{w},y)w^1 \\ &= E(\langle a', \sigma_{123}(\mathcal{Y}^{\boxtimes}_{W,W'})(\delta\mathcal{Y}^{\boxtimes}_{W,\widetilde{W}}(w,x-y)\widetilde{w},y)w^1\rangle) \end{aligned} \tag{5.9}$$

for any $w, w^1 \in W$, $\widetilde{w} \in \widetilde{W}$, and $a' \in W'$. Therefore, we have:

Lemma 19 *Let V be a simple VOA. If a simple V-module W is not semi-rigid, then the image of δ does not have a factor isomorphic to V and* $\mathrm{Ker}(\delta) + \mathrm{rad}^V(W \boxtimes \widetilde{W}) = W \boxtimes \widetilde{W}$ *for any $e_{\widetilde{W}}$.*

6 Orbifold model

In this section, we will consider an orbifold model. Let T be a VOA and g an automorphism of T order n and set $T = \oplus_{h=0}^{n-1} T^{(h)}$ with $T^{(h)} := \{t \in T \mid g(t) = e^{2\pi\sqrt{-1}h/n}t\}$. Then $V := T^{(0)} = T^g$ is a subVOA. Let D be a V-module and we assume that
(A1) every $T^{(i)} \boxtimes_V D$ is a V-module for $i = 0, ..., n-1$ and
(A2) every $T^{(i)}$ is C_1-cofinite as a $T^{(0)}$-module.

The necessary condition we need is an associativity of fusion products, that is, $T^{(i)} \boxtimes_V (T^{(j)} \boxtimes_V D) \cong (T^{(i)} \boxtimes_V T^{(j)}) \boxtimes_V D$.

Set $W^{(i)} = T^{(i)} \boxtimes_V D$ and $W = W^{(0)} \oplus \cdots \oplus W^{(n-1)}$. We note $W^{(0)} = V_V \boxtimes D = D$. Since all $T^{(i)}$ are C_1-cofinite as V-modules, there is $\mathcal{Y} \in \mathcal{I}\binom{W}{T\,W}$ such that

$$E(\langle w', \mathcal{Y}(t,x)\mathcal{Y}^{\boxtimes}_{T,D}(t^1,y)d\rangle) = E(\langle w', \mathcal{Y}^{\boxtimes}_{T,D}(Y(t,x-y)t^1,y)d\rangle) \tag{6.1}$$

for $t, t^1 \in T$, $w' \in W'$ and $d \in D$ by (5.2). We note $W^{(i)} = T^{(i)} \boxtimes D = \coprod_r (W^{(i)}_r)$ with formal weight spaces $W^{(i)}_r := (T^{(i)} \boxtimes D)_r$ and so we can define its restricted dual $(W^{(i)})' =$

$\coprod_r \mathrm{Hom}(W_r^{(i)}, \mathbb{C})$. From the definition of $\mathcal{Y}$ and Commutativity of vertex operators Y of T, we have that for any $t^1, t^2, t^3 \in T$,

$$\begin{aligned}E(\langle w', \mathcal{Y}(t^1, x)\mathcal{Y}(t^2, y)\mathcal{Y}^{\boxtimes}_{T,D}(t^3, z)d\rangle) &= E(\langle w', \mathcal{Y}(t^1, x)\mathcal{Y}^{\boxtimes}_{T,D}(Y(t^2, y-z)t^3, z)d\rangle)\\ &= E(\langle w', \mathcal{Y}^{\boxtimes}_{T,D}(Y(t^1, x-z)Y(t^2, y-z)t^3, z)d\rangle)\\ &= E(\langle w', \mathcal{Y}^{\boxtimes}_{T,D}(Y(t^2, y-z)Y(t^1, x-z)t^3, z)d\rangle)\\ &= E(\langle w', \mathcal{Y}(t^2, y)\mathcal{Y}(t^1, x)\mathcal{Y}^{\boxtimes}_{T,D}(t^3, z)d\rangle),\end{aligned}$$

which implies Commutativity of $\{\mathcal{Y}(t, z) \mid t \in T\}$ on W. We also have

$$\begin{aligned}E(\langle w', \mathcal{Y}(t^1, x)\mathcal{Y}(t^2, y)\mathcal{Y}^{\boxtimes}_{T,D}(t^3, z)p\rangle) &= E(\langle w', \mathcal{Y}^{\boxtimes}_{T,D}(Y(t^1, x-z)Y(t^2, y-z)t^3, z)p\rangle)\\ &= E(\langle w', \mathcal{Y}^{\boxtimes}_{T,D}(Y(Y(t^1, x-y)t^2, y-z)t^3, z)p\rangle)\\ &= E(\langle w', \mathcal{Y}(Y(t^1, x-y)t^2, z_2)\mathcal{Y}^{\boxtimes}_{T,D}(t^3, z)p\rangle).\end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, taking $t^1 = \mathbf{1}$ in (6.1), we have

$$\begin{aligned}E(\langle w', \mathcal{Y}(t, x)d\rangle) &= E(\langle w', \mathcal{Y}(t, x)\mathcal{Y}^{\boxtimes}_{T,D}(\mathbf{1}, y)d\rangle) = E(\langle w', \mathcal{Y}^{\boxtimes}_{T,D}(Y(t, x-y)\mathbf{1}, y)d\rangle)\\ &= E(\langle w', \mathcal{Y}^{\boxtimes}_{T,D}(e^{(x-y)L(-1)}t, y)p\rangle) = E(\langle w', \mathcal{Y}^{\boxtimes}_{T,D}(t, y+x-y)d\rangle).\end{aligned}$$

By setting $y = \frac{2}{3}x$, we obtain $\mathcal{Y}(t, x)d = \mathcal{Y}^{\boxtimes}_{T,D}(t, x)d$ for $t \in T, d \in D$.

Furthermore, we have:

Proposition 20 *Let T be a VOA and $g \in \mathrm{Aut}(T)$ of order n. If all $T^{(k)}$ are C_1-cofinite as $T^{(0)}$-modules and $T^{(k)} \boxtimes T^{(1)}$ are $T^{(0)}$-modules, then all $T^{(k)}$ are simple currents.*

[**Proof**] We will prove that $T^{(1)}$ is a simple current. The proofs for the others are similar. Take $T^{(1)}$ as D in the above argument and we assert that $U^{(0)} := T^{(n-1)} \boxtimes T^{(1)}$ is irreducible. Suppose false and let B be a proper submodule of $U^{(0)}$ and set

$$E = \langle \text{ the coefficients of } \mathcal{Y}(t^{(1)}, y)b \mid t^{(1)} \in T^{(1)}, b \in B\rangle_{\mathbb{C}}.$$

Since E is a submodule of $T^{(1)}$ and

$$\mathcal{Y}(t^{(n-1)}, x)\mathcal{Y}(t^{(1)}, y)b = \mathcal{Y}(Y(t^{(n-1)}, x-y)t^{(1)}, y)b, \tag{6.2}$$

for any $t^{(1)} \in T^{(1)}$, $t^{(n-1)} \in T^{(n-1)}$ and $b \in B$, there are $t \in T^{(1)}$ and $b \in B$ such that $\mathcal{Y}(t, y)b \neq 0$ and so we have $E \neq 0$. Therefore, we have $E = T^{(1)}$ since $T^{(1)}$ is simple. Since the coefficients of $\mathcal{Y}(t^{(1)}, y)b$ spans $T^{(1)}$, the left hand side of (6.2) implies that the coefficient of (6.2) spans $T^{(n-1)} \boxtimes T^{(1)}$. On the other hand, the right hand side of (6.2) implies that those spans B since the coefficients of $Y(t^{(n-1)}, x-y)t^{(1)}$ are actions of V. Therefore, $T^{(n-1)} \boxtimes T^{(1)} = V$. For any V-module W, $W = V \boxtimes W = (T^{(n-1)} \boxtimes T^{(1)}) \boxtimes W \cong T^{(n-1)} \boxtimes (T^{(1)} \boxtimes W)$, which implies that $T^{(1)} \boxtimes W$ is simple. ∎

As another application, we have:

Proposition 21 *Under the same assumption as in Proposition 20, if $0 \to B \to D \xrightarrow{\rho} V$ is a non-split extension of V by a simple V-module B, then $T \boxtimes_V D$ is a T-module. In particular, if T is projective as a T-module, then V is projective as a V-module.*

[**Proof**] By the previous arguments, it is sufficient to show that $\mathcal{Y}(t,x)$ is a formal integer power series. Since $(T^{(n-1)}\boxtimes T^{(1)})\boxtimes D\cong D$ and $T^{(1)}\boxtimes D$ is an indecomposable module with a homomorphic image $T^{(1)}\boxtimes V$, all weights of $T^{(1)}\boxtimes D$ are integers. Hence the formal powers are all integer powers. So the remaining thing is to show that $\mathcal{Y}(t,x)$ does not have $\log z$-terms. If $L(0)$ acts on D semisimply, then so does on $T^{(k)}\boxtimes D$ and every $\mathcal{Y}^{\boxtimes}_{T^{(k)},D}(t,z)$ is a formal integer power series, which implies that $T\boxtimes_V D$ is a T-module. If $L(0)$ does not act on D semisimply, then $L(0)^{nil}D=B$ and so $B\cong V$ as V-modules. Therefore, $L(0)^{nil}:(T\boxtimes_V D)/(T\boxtimes_V B)\to T\boxtimes_V B\cong T$ is an isomorphism as T-modules. If $\mathcal{Y}^{\boxtimes}_{T,D}(t,z)p$ is not a formal integer power series for $t\in T$ and $p\in D$, then we have:

$$\mathcal{Y}^{\boxtimes}_{T,D}(t,z)p=\sum_{m\in\mathbb{Z}}t_{(0,m)}pz^{-m-1}+\sum_{m\in\mathbb{Z}}t_{(1,m)}pz^{-m-1}\log z.$$

Set $\mathcal{Y}^{(0)}(t,z)=\sum_{m\in\mathbb{Z}}t_{(0,m)}z^{-m-1}$ and $\mathcal{Y}^{(1)}(t,z)=\sum_{m\in\mathbb{Z}}t_{(1,m)}z^{-m-1}\in \mathrm{Hom}((T\boxtimes_V D)/(T\boxtimes_V B),T\boxtimes_V B)[[z,z^{-1}]]$. Since $\dim\mathcal{I}\binom{T}{T\ T}=1$ as T-modules, we may assume $\mathcal{Y}^{(0)}(t,z)d\equiv Y(t,z)d \mod T\boxtimes_V B[[z,z^{-1}]]$ and $\mathcal{Y}^{(1)}(t,z)a=Y(t,z)\overline{a}$, where $\overline{a}$ denotes $\mathrm{id}_T\boxtimes\rho(a)$ and $a\in T\boxtimes_V D$. Therefore, we have $L(0)^{nil}\mathcal{Y}^{(0)}(t,z)a=Y(t,z)\bar{a}$ and $Y(t,z)\mathcal{Y}^{(0)}(t,z)L(0)^{nil}a=Y(t,z)\bar{a}$. In other words, $L(0)^{nil}$ commutes with $\mathcal{Y}^{(0)}$. By (2.1), we have

$$\begin{aligned} w_{(1,n)}d = & -(L(0)^{nil})t_{(0,n)}d+(L(0)^{nil}t)_{(0,n)}d+t_{(0,n)}(L(0)^{nil}d)\\ = & -(L(0)^{nil})t_{(0,n)}d+t_{(0,n)}(L(0)^{nil}d)=0. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $\mathcal{Y}(t,z)$ is a formal integer power series and so $T\boxtimes_V D$ is a T-module. ▮

7 Geometrically modified module

In this section, we will explain the theory of composition-invertible power series and their actions on modules for the Virasoro algebra developed in [10] and then we will extend them for logarithmic intertwining operators. From now on, q_x denotes $e^{2\pi ix}$ for variables $x\neq\tau$ to distinguish it from $q=e^{2\pi i\tau}$. Let A_j $(j=1,2,...)$ be the complex numbers defined by

$$\frac{1}{2\pi i}(q_y-1)=\left(\exp\left(-\sum_{j=1}^{\infty}A_jy^{j+1}\frac{\partial}{\partial y}\right)\right)y$$

and set

$$\mathcal{U}(q_x)={q_x}^{L(0)}(2\pi i)^{L(0)}e^{-\sum_{j=1}^{\infty}A_jL(j)}.$$

Clearly, $\mathcal{U}(q_x)={q_x}^{L(0)}\mathcal{U}(1)$. The important operator is $\mathcal{U}(1)$, which satisfies

$$\mathcal{U}(1)\mathcal{Y}(w,x)\mathcal{U}(1)^{-1}=\mathcal{Y}(\mathcal{U}(q_x)w,q_x-1)=\mathcal{Y}({q_x}^{L(0)}\mathcal{U}(1)w,q_x-1)=\mathcal{Y}[\mathcal{U}(1)w,x] \quad (7.1)$$

for an intertwining operator $\mathcal{Y}$, see [21] for $\mathcal{Y}[\cdot,x]$.

7.1 Trace functions

We first consider q-traces of geometrically-modified module operators with one more variable z:

$$\Psi_U(v; z, \tau) := \mathrm{Tr}_U Y(\mathcal{U}(q_z)v, q_z)q^{(L(0)-c/24)} \tag{7.2}$$

for a V-module U and $v \in V$, where Tr_U denotes a trace on U and c is the central charge of V. We note that for an ordinary trace function, we can consider the trace functions for not only actions of V but also actions of a V-module W on U by $\mathcal{Y} \in \mathcal{I}\binom{U}{W\ U}$. Namely, we can define a trace function

$$\Psi_U(\mathcal{Y}; w; z, \tau) := \mathrm{Tr}_U(\mathcal{Y}(\mathcal{U}(q_z)w, q_z)q^{(L(0)-c/24)}) \qquad w \in W. \tag{7.3}$$

We have to note that $L(0)$ may not be semisimple on a V-module U. Then we will understand $q^{L(0)}$ on U as

$$q^{L(0)} := q^{(\mathrm{wt}+L(0)^{nil})} = q^{\mathrm{wt}}(e^{2\pi i\tau L(0)^{nil}}) = q^{\mathrm{wt}}\sum_{j=0}^{\infty}\frac{(2\pi i\tau L(0)^{nil})^j}{j!}.$$

We note that since $L(0)^{nil}$ is a nilpotent operator and commutes with all grade-preserving operators, there are no terms of form $q^r\tau^j$ in ordinary trace functions for $j > 0$.

We note that when we consider a trace function of a simple module W on a V-module U, as we explained at the end of §2.2, we can ignore the $\log z$ terms of $\mathcal{Y}^U_{W,U} \in \mathcal{I}\binom{U}{W\ U}$ and so the necessary grade-preserving operator of $w \in W_r$ in $\mathcal{Y}^U_{W,U}(w, z) = \sum_i\sum_m w^{\mathcal{Y}}_{(i,m)}z^{-m-1}\log^i z$ is $w^{\mathcal{Y}}_{(0,r-1)}$. Therefore, by setting $\mathcal{U}(1)w = \sum_r w^r$ with homogeneous elements $w^r \in W_r$, we have

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \mathrm{Tr}_U\mathcal{Y}^U_{W,U}(\mathcal{U}(q_z)w, q_z)q^{(L(0)-c/24)} & = & \sum_r \mathrm{Tr}_U {q_z}^{(\mathrm{wt}(w^r))}w^r_{(0,r-1)}q^{(-r)}q^{(L(0)-c/24)} \\ & = & \sum_r \mathrm{Tr}_U w^r_{(0,r-1)}q^{(L(0)-c/24)}. \end{array} \tag{7.4}$$

Thus, (7.4) is independent of z. Moreover, it has shown in [10] that these q-traces are absolutely convergent when $0 < |q| < 1$ and can be analytically extended to analytic functions of τ in the upper-half plane.

We next consider q-traces of products of two geometrically-modified intertwining operators:

$$\begin{array}{l} \mathrm{Tr}_U\mathcal{Y}_1(\mathcal{U}(q_y)\mathcal{Y}^{\boxtimes}_{W,\widetilde{W}}(w, x-y)\widetilde{w}, q_y)q^{(L(0)-c/24)} \\ \mathrm{Tr}_U\mathcal{Y}_2(\mathcal{U}(q_x)w, q_x)\mathcal{Y}^{\boxtimes}_{\widetilde{W},U}(\mathcal{U}(q_y)\widetilde{w}, q_y)q^{(L(0)-c/24)} \end{array} \tag{7.5}$$

for $w \in W, \widetilde{w} \in \widetilde{W}$, $\mathcal{Y}_1 \in \mathcal{I}\binom{U}{W\boxtimes\widetilde{W}\ U}$, and $\mathcal{Y}_2 \in \mathcal{I}\binom{U}{W\ \widetilde{W}\boxtimes U}$. As we explained, the first function in (7.5) depends on $x - y$, but not on y. These formal power series (with log-terms) are absolutely convergent in $\Omega_1 = \{(x, y, \tau) \in \mathbb{C}^2 \oplus \mathcal{H} \mid 0 < |q_x - q_y| < |q_y|\}$ and $\Omega_2 = \{(x, y, \tau) \in \mathbb{C}^2 \oplus \mathcal{H} \mid 0 < |q| < |q_y| < |q_x| < 1\}$, respectively, as shown in [10], where $\mathcal{H} = \{\tau \in \mathbb{C} \mid \mathrm{Im}(\tau) > 0\}$ is the upper half plane. We extend these function analytically to multivalued analytic functions on

$$M^2_1 = \{(x, y, \tau) \in \mathbb{C}^2 \times \mathcal{H} \mid x \neq y + p\tau + q \quad \text{for all } p, q \in \mathbb{Z}\}.$$

We can lift them to single valued analytic functions

$$\begin{array}{l} \Psi_U(\mathcal{Y}_1(\mathcal{Y}^{\boxtimes}_{W,\widetilde{W}}) : w, \widetilde{w}; x, y, \tau) := E(\mathrm{Tr}_U\mathcal{Y}_1(\mathcal{U}(q_y)\mathcal{Y}^{\boxtimes}_{W,\widetilde{W}}(w, x-y)\widetilde{w}, q_y)q^{(L(0)-c/24)}) \\ \Psi_U(\mathcal{Y}_2\mathcal{Y}^{\boxtimes}_{\widetilde{W},U} : w, \widetilde{w}; x, y, \tau) := E(\mathrm{Tr}_U\mathcal{Y}_2(\mathcal{U}(q_x)w, q_x)\mathcal{Y}^{\boxtimes}_{\widetilde{W},U}(\mathcal{U}(q_y)\widetilde{w}, q_y)q^{(L(0)-c/24)}) \end{array} \tag{7.6}$$

on the universal covering $\widetilde{M_1^2}$. We need to extend a result in [11] for logarithmic intertwining operators.

Lemma 22 *For every intertwining operator* $\mathcal{Y} \in \mathcal{I}\binom{T}{B,U}$, $w \in W$ *and* $b \in B$, *we have*

$$\begin{array}{l} e^{\tau L(0)}\mathcal{Y}(b,z)u = \mathcal{Y}(e^{\tau L(0)}b, e^{\tau}z)e^{\tau L(0)}u \\ q^{L(0)}\mathcal{Y}(\mathcal{U}(q_y)b, q_y) = \mathcal{Y}(\mathcal{U}(q_yq)b, q_yq)q^{L(0)} \qquad \textit{and} \\ \mathcal{Y}_1(\mathcal{Y}_2(\mathcal{U}(q_y)b, q_y - q_x)\mathcal{U}(q_x)w, q_x) = \mathcal{Y}_1(\mathcal{U}(q_x)\mathcal{Y}_2(b, y-x)w, q_x). \end{array}$$

[**Proof**] Set $\mathcal{Y}(b,z) = \sum_{h=0}^{K}\sum_{n\in\mathbb{C}} b_{(h,n)}z^{-n-1}\log^h z$ and $y = \log z$. From $\mathcal{Y}(L(-1)b,z) = \frac{d}{dz}\mathcal{Y}(b,z)$, we have $(L(-1)b)_{(h,n+1)} = (-n-1)b_{(h,n)} + (h+1)b_{(h+1,n-1)}$ and

$[L(0), b_{(h,n)}]u = (L(-1)b)_{(h,n+1)} + (L(0)b)_{(h,n)} = (-n-1)b_{(h,n)} + (h+1)b_{(h+1,n)} + (L(0)b)_{(h,n)}$.

Using the notations $(\alpha\otimes\beta)b_{(k,n)}u = (\alpha b)_{(k,n)}\beta u$, we have:

$$\begin{array}{l} L(0)(b_{(h,n)}u) = (-n-1+L(0)\otimes 1 + 1\otimes L(0))b_{(h,n)}u + (h+1)b_{(h+1,n)} \qquad \text{and} \\ L(0)^m(b_{(h,n)}u) = \sum_{j=0}^{m}\binom{m}{j}(-n-1+L(0)\otimes 1 + 1\otimes L(0))^{m-j}(h+1)\cdots(h+j)b_{(h+j,n)}u. \end{array}$$

for $m \geq 1$, where $(h+1)\cdots(h+j) = 1$ for $j = 0$. Using these notation, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} & e^{\tau L(0)}\mathcal{Y}(b,z)u = \sum_{n} e^{\tau L(0)}(\sum_{h=0}^{K} b_{(h,n)}uy^h)e^{(-n-1)y} \\ =& \sum_{n}\sum_{m=0}^{\infty}\sum_{h=0}^{\infty}\frac{L(0)^m\tau^m}{m!}(\sum_{h} b_{(h,n)}uy^h e^{(-n-1)y}) \\ =& \sum_{n}\sum_{m,h}\frac{\tau^m}{m!}\sum_{j=0}^{m}\binom{m}{j}(L(0)\otimes 1+1\otimes L(0)-n-1)^{m-j}(h+1)\cdots(h+j)b_{(h+j,n)}uy^h e^{(-n-1)y} \end{aligned}$$

By replacing $h+j$ and $m-j$ by k and i, respectively, $e^{\tau L(0)}\mathcal{Y}(b,z)u$ equals

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{n}\sum_{k}\sum_{i=0}^{\infty}\sum_{j=0}^{\infty}\frac{\tau^i(L(0)\otimes 1+1\otimes L(0)-n-1)^i}{i!}\frac{1}{j!}(k-j+1)\cdots(k)\tau^j y^{k-j}b_{(k,n)}ue^{(-n-1)y} \\ =& \sum_{n}\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} e^{\tau(L(0)\otimes 1+1\otimes L(0)-(n+1))}b_{(k,n)}u(y+\tau)^k e^{(-n-1)y} \\ =& \sum_{n}\sum_{k}(e^{\tau L(0)}b)_{(k,n)}(e^{\tau L(0)}u)e^{(-n-1)(y+\tau)}(y+\tau)^k = \mathcal{Y}(e^{\tau L(0)}b, e^{\tau+y})e^{\tau L(0)}u \\ =& \mathcal{Y}(e^{\tau L(0)}b, e^{\tau}z)e^{\tau L(0)}u, \end{aligned}$$

which proves the first equation. Replacing τ and y by $2\pi i\tau$ and $2\pi iy$, respectively, we have the second equation. The third comes from $\mathcal{U}(1)\mathcal{Y}(b,x) = \mathcal{Y}(\mathcal{U}(q_x)b, q_x - 1)\mathcal{U}(1)$ and the second equation. ∎

8 Transformations

Let V be a simple C_2-cofinite VOA of CFT-type. We fix two irreducible V-modules W and $\widetilde{W}$ such that $\mathrm{Hom}_V(\widetilde{W}\boxtimes W, V) \neq 0$. In this section, we always assume that the desired fusion products are V-modules and the products of intertwining operators of W and $\widetilde{W}$ satisfy the associativity.

8.1 Three transformations

We define actions S, α_t, β_t on R^1_2 for $0 \le t \le 1$ by

$$\begin{array}{rl} \alpha_t & : (x,y,\tau) \mapsto (x, y+t\tau, \tau) \\ \beta_t & : (x,y,\tau) \mapsto (x, y+t, \tau) \\ S & : (x,y,\tau) \mapsto (-x/\tau, -y/\tau, -1/\tau) \end{array} .$$

In particular, we have the following commutative diagram:

$$\begin{tikzcd} (x,y,\tau) \arrow[r, "S"] \arrow[d, "\beta_t"] & (-x/\tau, -y/\tau, -1/\tau) \arrow[d, "\alpha_t"] \\ (x, y+t, \tau) \arrow[r, "S"] & (-x/\tau, -y/\tau - t/\tau, -1/\tau). \end{tikzcd} \tag{8.1}$$

A trace function of products $\mathcal{Y}_1(\mathcal{Y})$ with $\mathcal{Y}_1 \in \mathcal{I}\binom{U}{E\ U}, \mathcal{Y} \in \mathcal{I}\binom{E}{\widetilde{W}\ W}$ on U is

$$\Psi_U(\mathcal{Y}_1(\mathcal{Y}) : \widetilde{w}, w; x, y, \tau) = E\left(\mathrm{Tr}_U \mathcal{Y}_1\left(\mathcal{U}(q_y)\mathcal{Y}(\widetilde{w}, x-y)w, q_y\right) q^{(L(0)-c/24)}\right), \tag{8.2}$$

for $w \in W, \widetilde{w} \in \widetilde{W}$. A modular transformation $S : \tau \to -1/\tau$ on Ψ_U is defined by

$$S\left(\Psi_U\right)\left(\mathcal{Y}_1(\mathcal{Y}) : \widetilde{w}, w; x, y, \tau\right) = \Psi_U\left(\mathcal{Y}_1(\mathcal{Y}) : \left(\frac{-1}{\tau}\right)^{L(0)} \widetilde{w}, \left(\frac{-1}{\tau}\right)^{L(0)} w; \frac{-x}{\tau}, \frac{-y}{\tau}; \frac{-1}{\tau}\right).$$

In order to simplify the arguments, we will deal only W and $\widetilde{W}$ with integer weights when we consider the transformation S. When $\mathcal{Y}_1$ is a vertex operator Y^U on a module, the space spanned by trace functions has some modular invariance property as the author has shown in [14]. In particular, since we assume Condition II, that is, there are $\lambda_U \in \mathbb{C}$ for $U \in \mathrm{Irr}(V)$ such that

$$S\left(\Psi_V\right)\left(Y^U(\mathcal{Y}) : \widetilde{w}, w; x, y, \tau\right) = \sum_{U \in \mathrm{Irr}(V)} \lambda_U \left(\Psi_U\right)\left(Y^U(\mathcal{Y}) : \widetilde{w}, w; x, y, \tau\right), \tag{8.4}$$

where $\mathrm{Irr}(V)$ denotes the set of irreducible V-modules. We note that λ_U does not depend on the choice $\mathcal{Y} \in \mathcal{I}\binom{V}{W\ \tilde{W}}$, but on V.

Along a line $\mathcal{L} = \{(x, y+t, \tau) \mid t \in [0,1]\}$ from (x,y,τ) to $(x, y+1, \tau)$, we define

$$\alpha_t(\Psi_U)(\mathcal{Y} : \widetilde{w}, w; x, y, \tau) := \Psi_U(\mathcal{Y} : \widetilde{w}, w; x, y+t, \tau) \tag{8.5}$$

and set $\alpha = \alpha_1$. Since $(x,y,\tau) \to (x, y+t, \tau)$ preserves $\Omega_2 = \{(x,y,\tau) \in \mathbb{C}^2 \oplus H \mid |q| < |q_y| < |q_x| < 1\}$, we have

$$\begin{array}{rl} \alpha_t(\Psi_U)(\mathcal{Y}_1(\mathcal{Y}_2) : \widetilde{w}, w; x, y, \tau) = & \alpha_t(\mathrm{Tr}_U \mathcal{Y}_3(\mathcal{U}(q_x)\widetilde{w}, q_x)\mathcal{Y}^{\boxtimes}_{\widetilde{W},U}(\mathcal{U}(q_y)w, q_y)q^{(L(0)-c/24)}) \\ = & \mathrm{Tr}_U \mathcal{Y}_3(\mathcal{U}(q_x)\widetilde{w}, q_x)\mathcal{Y}^{\boxtimes}_{\widetilde{W},U}(\mathcal{U}(q_y q^t)w, q_y q^t)q^{(L(0)-c/24)} \\ = & \mathrm{Tr}_U \mathcal{Y}_4(\mathcal{U}(q_y)\mathcal{Y}_5(\widetilde{w}, x-y)w, q_y)q^{(L(0)-c/24)} \\ = & \Psi_U(\mathcal{Y}_4(\mathcal{Y}_5) : \widetilde{w}, w; x, y, \tau) \end{array} \tag{8.6}$$

for some $\mathcal{Y}_3$ and $\mathcal{Y}_4(\mathcal{Y}_5)$, because $\mathcal{Y}^{\boxtimes}_{W,U}(\mathcal{U}(q_y q^t)w, q_y q^t)$ is a linear combination of geometrically modified intertwining operators in $\mathcal{I}\binom{\boxtimes}{W\ U}$.

An important case is where $U = V$ and $\mathcal{Y}_1(\mathcal{Y}_2) = Y(\mathcal{Y})$ with $\mathcal{Y} \in \mathcal{I}\binom{V}{\widetilde{W}\ W}$. Then since $W \boxtimes V = W$ is irreducible,

$$\alpha(\Psi_V)(Y(\mathcal{Y})) = e^{2\pi i \mathrm{wt}(W)}\Psi_V(Y(\mathcal{Y})).$$

We set $\kappa = e^{2\pi i \mathrm{wt}(W)}$. We then define β_t and $\beta = \beta_1$ according to a line $S^{-1}(\mathcal{L})$ by

$$\beta_t(\Psi_U)(\mathcal{Y}_1(\mathcal{Y}_2) : \widetilde{w}, w; x, y, \tau) = \Psi_U(\mathcal{Y}_1(\mathcal{Y}_2) : \widetilde{w}, w; x, y + t\tau, \tau) \text{ for any } \Psi_U. \tag{8.7}$$

Proposition 23

$$\beta_t(S(\Psi_V))) = S(\alpha_t(\Psi_V)). \tag{8.8}$$

By (8.4), we will consider the following diagram:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\Psi_V(Y(\mathcal{Y})) \arrow[d, "S"] \arrow[rr, "\alpha"] & & \kappa\Psi_V(Y(\mathcal{Y})) \arrow[d, "S"] \\
\sum \lambda_U \Psi_U(Y^U(\mathcal{Y})) \arrow[r, "\beta"] & \sum \lambda_U \beta(\Psi_U(Y^U(\mathcal{Y})) & \kappa \sum \lambda_U \Psi_U(Y^U(\mathcal{Y}))
\end{tikzcd}$$

Therefore $\sum \lambda_U \beta(\Psi_U(Y^U(\mathcal{Y})) = \kappa \sum \lambda_U \Psi_U(Y^U(\mathcal{Y}))$.

8.2 The image of β

We first calculate the image of $\Psi_U(\mathcal{Y}^1(\mathcal{Y}^2) : \widetilde{w}, w; x, y, \tau)$ by β for any $\mathcal{Y}^2 \in \mathcal{I}\binom{S}{\widetilde{W}\ W}$ and $\mathcal{Y}^1 \in \mathcal{I}\binom{U}{S\ U}$. Set $A = (W \boxtimes U)$, then we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\beta(\Psi_U)(\mathcal{Y}^1(\mathcal{Y}^2) : \widetilde{w}, w; x, y, \tau)\\
&= E(\mathrm{Tr}_U \mathcal{Y}^1(\mathcal{U}(e^{2\pi i(y+\tau)})\mathcal{Y}^2(\widetilde{w}, x - (y + \tau))w, e^{2\pi i(y+\tau)})q^{(L(0)-\frac{c}{24})})\\
&= E(\mathrm{Tr}_U \mathcal{Y}^1(\mathcal{Y}^2(\mathcal{U}(q_x)\widetilde{w}, q_x - e^{2\pi i(y+\tau)})\mathcal{U}(e^{2\pi i(y+\tau)})w, q_y q)q^{(L(0)-\frac{c}{24})}) \quad \text{by Lemma 22}\\
&= E(\mathrm{Tr}_U \sigma_{23}(\mathcal{Y}^{\boxtimes}_{\widetilde{W},U'})(\mathcal{U}(q_x)\widetilde{w}, q_x)\xi_U \mathcal{Y}^{\boxtimes}_{W,U}(\mathcal{U}(q_y q)w, q_y q)q^{(L(0)-\frac{c}{24})})\\
&\qquad\qquad \text{for some } \xi_U \in \mathrm{Hom}_V(W \boxtimes U, (\widetilde{W \boxtimes U'})')\\
&= E(\mathrm{Tr}_U \sigma_{23}(\mathcal{Y}^{\boxtimes}_{\widetilde{W},U'})(\mathcal{U}(q_x)\widetilde{w}, q_x)q^{(L(0)-\frac{c}{24})}\xi_U \mathcal{Y}^{\boxtimes}_{W,U}(\mathcal{U}(q_y)w, q_y)) \qquad \text{by Lemma 22}\\
&= E(\mathrm{Tr}_U \sigma_{23}(\mathcal{Y}^{\boxtimes}_{\widetilde{W},U'})(\mathcal{U}(q_x)\widetilde{w}, q_x)\xi_U q^{(L(0)-\frac{c}{24})}\mathcal{Y}^{\boxtimes}_{W,U}(\mathcal{U}(q_y)w, q_y))\\
&= E(\mathrm{Tr}_A \mathcal{Y}^{\boxtimes}_{W,U}(\mathcal{U}(q_y)w, q_y)\sigma_{23}(\mathcal{Y}^{\boxtimes}_{\widetilde{W},U'})(\mathcal{U}(q_x)\widetilde{w}, q_x)\xi_U q^{(L(0)-c/24)})\\
&\qquad\qquad \text{because the trace is symmetric}\\
&= E(\mathrm{Tr}_A \sigma_{123}(\mathcal{Y}^{\boxtimes}_{A,A'}(\delta_U \mathcal{Y}^{\boxtimes}_{W,\widetilde{W}})(\mathcal{U}(q_y)w, q_y - q_x)\mathcal{U}(q_x)\widetilde{w}, q_x)q^{(L(0)-c/24)})\\
&\qquad\qquad \text{for some } \delta_U \in \mathrm{Hom}_V(W \boxtimes \widetilde{W}, (A \boxtimes A')')\\
&= E(\mathrm{Tr}_A \sigma_{123}(\mathcal{Y}^{\boxtimes}_{A,A'})(\delta_U \mathcal{U}(q_x)\mathcal{Y}^{\boxtimes}_{W,\widetilde{W}}(w, y - x)\widetilde{w}, q_x)q^{(L(0)-c/24)}) \qquad \text{by Lemma 22}\\
&= E(\mathrm{Tr}_A \sigma_{123}(\mathcal{Y}^{\boxtimes}_{A,A'})(\delta_U {q_x}^{L(0)}\mathcal{U}(1)e^{L(-1)(y-x)}\sigma_{12}(\mathcal{Y}^{\boxtimes}_{W,\widetilde{W}})(\widetilde{w}, x - y)w, q_x)q^{(L(0)-c/24)})\\
&\qquad\qquad \text{by skew symmetry intertwining operator, see (5.5).}
\end{aligned}$$

Set $L[-1] = L(-1) + L(0)$ (see [21]). Then we get $U(1)e^{L(-1)z} = e^{(2\pi i)L[-1]z}U(1)$ from (7.1) and the above equals the following:

$$= E(\mathrm{Tr}_A \sigma_{123}(\mathcal{Y}^{\boxtimes}_{A,A'})(\delta_U {q_x}^{L(0)} e^{(2\pi i)L[-1](y-x)}\mathcal{U}(1)\sigma_{12}(\mathcal{Y}^{\boxtimes}_{W,\widetilde{W}})(\widetilde{w}, x - y)w, q_x)q^{(L(0)-c/24)}).$$

As we explained in the paragraph after (7.5), the pair of terms ${q_x}^{L(0)}$ and q_x in the above expression has no influence and the next term is $e^{(2\pi i)L[-1](y-x)}$. However, since $o_0(L[-1]u)=0$ for any $u\in \widetilde{W}\boxtimes W$, we finally have

$$\begin{aligned}&\beta(\Psi_U)(Y^U(\mathcal{Y}^V_{\widetilde{W},W}):\widetilde{w},w;x,y,\tau)\\ &\quad=E(\mathrm{Tr}_A\sigma_{123}(\mathcal{Y}^{\boxtimes}_{A,A'})\mathcal{U}(q_x)\delta_U\sigma_{12}(\mathcal{Y}^{\boxtimes}_{W,\widetilde{W}}))(\widetilde{w},x-y)w,q_x)q^{(L(0)-c/24)}).\end{aligned} \tag{8.9}$$

In particular, we have the following lemma.

Lemma 24 *$\beta(\Psi_U)(\mathcal{Y}^1(\mathcal{Y}^2))$ is again an ordinary trace function of an intertwining operator of $W\boxtimes\widetilde{W}$ on some module.*

Therefore, we have:

Lemma 25 *When $\mathcal{Y}^1=Y^U$ and $\mathcal{Y}^2=e_{\widetilde{W}}\mathcal{Y}^{\boxtimes}_{\widetilde{W}\,W}$, δ_U coincides with δ in (5.9). In particular, δ_U does not depend on U.*

[**Proof**] We express the definitions of ξ_U and δ_U in a short way:

$$Y^U(\mathcal{Y}^V_{\widetilde{W},W})=\sigma_{23}(\mathcal{Y}^{\boxtimes}_{\widetilde{W},U'})\xi_U\mathcal{Y}^{\boxtimes}_{W,U}\quad\text{and}\quad \mathcal{Y}^{\boxtimes}_{W,U}\sigma_{23}(\mathcal{Y}^{\boxtimes}_{\widetilde{W},U'})\xi_U=\sigma_{123}(\mathcal{Y}^{\boxtimes}_{A,A'})(\delta_U\mathcal{Y}^{\boxtimes}_{W,\widetilde{W}}). \tag{8.10}$$

For $a'\in A'$, $\widetilde{w}\in\widetilde{W}$, $w,w^1\in W$ and $u\in U$, let us consider

$$\langle a',\mathcal{Y}^{\boxtimes}_{W,U}(w^1,x)Y^U(e_{\widetilde{W}}\mathcal{Y}^{\boxtimes}_{\widetilde{W},W}(\widetilde{w},y-z)w,z)u\rangle \tag{8.11}$$

into two ways. Set $B=\mathrm{Image}(\delta_U)$, then there is $\mathcal{Y}^{(U\boxtimes A')'}_{B,W}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}(8.11)\ &=\langle a',\mathcal{Y}^{\boxtimes}_{W,U}(w^1,x)\sigma_{23}(\mathcal{Y}^{\boxtimes}_{\widetilde{W},U'})(\widetilde{w},y)\xi_U\mathcal{Y}^{\boxtimes}_{W,U}(w,z)u\rangle\\ &=\langle a',\sigma_{123}(\mathcal{Y}^{\boxtimes}_{A,A'})(\delta_U\mathcal{Y}^{\boxtimes}_{W,\widetilde{W}}(w^1,x-y)\widetilde{w},y)\mathcal{Y}^{\boxtimes}_{W,U}(w,z)u\rangle\\ &=\langle a',\sigma_{123}(\mathcal{Y}^{\boxtimes}_{U,A'})\mathcal{Y}^{(U\boxtimes A')'}_{B,W}(\delta_U\mathcal{Y}^{\boxtimes}_{W,\widetilde{W}}(w^1,x-y)\widetilde{w},y-z)w,z)u\rangle.\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, there is $\mathcal{Y}^W_{W,V}\in\mathcal{I}\binom{W}{W\ V}$ and $\epsilon\in\mathrm{Hom}_V(W,(U\boxtimes A')')$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}(8.11)=\ &\langle a',\mathcal{Y}^{\boxtimes}_{W,U}(Y^W_{W,V}(w^1,x-z)e_{\widetilde{W}}\mathcal{Y}^{\boxtimes}_{\widetilde{W},W}(\widetilde{w},y-z)w,z)u\rangle\\ =\ &\langle a',\sigma_{123}(\mathcal{Y}^{\boxtimes}_{U,A'})(\epsilon Y^W_{W,V}(w^1,x-z)e_{\widetilde{W}}\mathcal{Y}^{\boxtimes}_{\widetilde{W},W}(\widetilde{w},y-z)w,z)u\rangle\end{aligned}$$

for any $a'\in A'$ and $u\in U$. We note $\mathcal{Y}^W_{W,V}\in\mathbb{C}\sigma_{12}(Y^W)$. Therefore, we have

$$\epsilon Y^W_{W,V}(w^1,x-z)e_{\widetilde{W}}\mathcal{Y}^{\boxtimes}_{\widetilde{W},W}(\widetilde{w},y-z)w=\mathcal{Y}^{(U\boxtimes A')'}_{B,W}(\delta_U\mathcal{Y}^{\boxtimes}_{W,\widetilde{W}}(w^1,x-z)\widetilde{w},y-z)w.$$

Since the image of ϵ is W, we obtain

$$\epsilon Y^W_{W,V}(w^1,x-z)\mathcal{Y}^{\boxtimes}_{\widetilde{W},W}(\widetilde{w},y-z)w=\mathcal{Y}^W_{B,W}(\delta_U\mathcal{Y}^{\boxtimes}_{W,\widetilde{W}}(w^1,x-z)\widetilde{w},y-z)w$$

for some $\mathcal{Y}^W_{B,W}$. Thus, δ_U essentially coincides with δ in (5.9), which does not depend on the choice of U. ∎

9 Key Theorem

Theorem 26 *If a simple C_2-cofinite V of CFT-type satisfies Condition I and Condition II, then all simple V-modules are semi-rigid. Furthermore, if V is a rational VOA of CFT-type satisfying Condition I, then Ψ_U has nonzero coefficient in $S(\Psi_V)$ for every simple V-module U.*

[**Proof**] Let W be an irreducible module. As we showed in Lemma 25,

$$\begin{aligned}\beta(\sum\lambda_U\Psi_U)(Y(e_{\widetilde{W}}\mathcal{Y}^{\boxtimes}_{\widetilde{W},W})) = & \sum\lambda_U\beta(\Psi_U)(Y(e_{\widetilde{W}}\mathcal{Y}^{\boxtimes}_{\widetilde{W},W})) \\ = & \sum\lambda_U\Psi_{W\boxtimes U}(\mathcal{Y}^U_{B,U}(\delta\mathcal{Y}^{\boxtimes}_{W,\widetilde{W}})),\end{aligned}$$

where $B=\mathrm{Image}(\delta)$ and U runs over $\mathrm{Irr}(V)$. On the other hand, since $\beta(S(\Psi_V))=S(\alpha(\Psi_V))$, we obtain

$$\beta(\sum\lambda_U\Psi_U(Y(e_{\widetilde{W}}\mathcal{Y}^{\boxtimes}_{\widetilde{W},W}))=\kappa(\sum\lambda_U\Psi_U(Y(e_{\widetilde{W}}\mathcal{Y}^{\boxtimes}_{\widetilde{W},W})),$$

where $\kappa=e^{2\pi i\mathrm{wt}(W)}$. Therefore, we have

$$\sum\lambda_U\Psi_{W\boxtimes U}(\mathcal{Y}^U_{B,U}(\delta\mathcal{Y}^{\boxtimes}_{W,\widetilde{W}}))=\kappa(\sum\lambda_U\Psi_U(Y(e_{\widetilde{W}}\mathcal{Y}^{\boxtimes}_{\widetilde{W},W})).$$

Suppose that W is not semi-rigid. Since V is C_2-cofinite, all weights of modules U are rational numbers. For any natural integer n, V satisfies Condition I and II if and only if $V^{\otimes n}$ does and Ψ_U appears in $S(\Psi_V)$ if and only if $\Psi_{U^{\otimes n}}$ appears in $S(\Psi_{V^{\otimes n}})$ and W is semi-rigid if and only if so is $W^{\otimes n}$. Therefore, by taking $V^{\otimes n}$ and $W^{\otimes n}$ as V and W if necessary, we may assume that the conformal weight $\mathrm{wt}(W)$ of W is an integer. By Lemma 19, $\mathrm{Ker}(\delta)+\mathrm{Ker}(e_{\widetilde{W}})=\widetilde{W}\boxtimes W$. Set $Q=\mathrm{Ker}(\delta)\cap\mathrm{Ker}(e_{\widetilde{W}})$ and $W\boxtimes\widetilde{W}/Q=Q^1\oplus Q^2$ with $Q^1=\mathrm{Ker}(e_{\widetilde{W}})/Q$ and $Q^2=\mathrm{Ker}(\delta)/Q\cong V$. Then $\Psi_{W\boxtimes U}(\mathcal{Y}^U_{B,U}(\delta\mathcal{Y}^{\boxtimes}_{W,\widetilde{W}}))$ are all given by traces on Q^1 and $\Psi_U(Y(e_{\widetilde{W}}\mathcal{Y}^{\boxtimes}_{\widetilde{W},W})$ are all given by traces on Q^2. We hence have

$$\sum\lambda_U\Psi_{W\boxtimes U}(\mathcal{Y}^U_{B,U}(\delta\mathcal{Y}^{\boxtimes}_{W,\widetilde{W}}))=0,$$

which contradicts to $\sum\lambda_U\Psi_U(Y(e_{\widetilde{W}}\mathcal{Y}^{\boxtimes}_{\widetilde{W},W})\neq 0$. Therefore, W is semi-rigid. Since W is arbitrary, all irreducible V-modules are semi-rigid.

We next prove the second statement and assume that V is rational. We first show $\lambda_{V'}\neq 0$. Choose a simple module U so that $\lambda_U\neq 0$. Set $W=U'$ and consider the trace function of $e_{\widetilde{W}}\mathcal{Y}^{\boxtimes}_{\widetilde{W},W}$ in $\beta(\Psi_U)(e_{\widetilde{W}}\mathcal{Y}^{\boxtimes}_{\widetilde{W},W})$. It has a nonzero scalar times of

$$\Psi_{W\boxtimes U}(e_{\widetilde{W}}\mathcal{Y}^{\boxtimes}_{\widetilde{W},W})$$

and so it has a term $\Psi_{V'}(e_{\widetilde{W}}\mathcal{Y}^{\boxtimes}_{\widetilde{W},W})$ with a nonzero coefficient. On the other hand, for any V-modules $R\neq U$, $\beta(\Psi_R(e_{\widetilde{W}}\mathcal{Y}^{\boxtimes}_{\widetilde{W},W})$ has no entries of $\Psi_{V'}(e_{\widetilde{W}}\mathcal{Y}^{\boxtimes}_{\widetilde{W},W})$. Therefore, $\Psi_{V'}(e_{\widetilde{W}}\mathcal{Y}^{\boxtimes}_{\widetilde{W},W})$ has nonzero coefficient in $\beta(\sum\lambda_U\Psi_U(Y(e_{\widetilde{W}}\mathcal{Y}^{\boxtimes}_{\widetilde{W},W}))$.

The remaining thing is to prove $\lambda_U\neq 0$ for every simple module U. Set $W=U'$. As we showed, $\lambda_{V'}\neq 0$ and so there is a simple V-module R with $\lambda_R\neq 0$ such that $\beta(\Psi_R)(Y^R(\mathcal{Y}^V_{\widetilde{W},W}))$ has nonzero coefficient at $\Psi_{V'}(Y^U(\mathcal{Y}^V_{\widetilde{W},W}))$. Then since $\mathrm{Hom}_V(R\boxtimes W,V')\neq 0$, we have $R=(W)'=U$ and so $\lambda_U\neq 0$ as we desired.
This completes the proof of Theorem 26. ∎

10 Rationality of orbifold model

In this section, we will show that an orbifold model $R^{(0)}$ satisfies Condition II and prove the rationality of $T^{(0)}$ under the assumption that $T^{(0)}$ is C_2-cofinite and T is rational.

Theorem 27 *Let g be a finite automorphism of a VOA T of order n and assume that a fixed point subVOA $V := T^g$ is a simple C_2-cofinite of CFT-type and satisfies Condition I, If T satisfies Condition II, then so does V. In particular, if T is rational and V satisfies Condition I, then V is rational and every simple V-module is a submodule of some g^k-twisted T-module.*

[**Proof**] Set $V = T^{(0)}$. As Dong, Li and Mason have shown in [3], there is a g-twisted simple T-module M, say $M = \oplus_{m=0}^{\infty} M_{\lambda+m/n}$. Then for each $i = 0, \ldots, n-1$, $W^{(i)} = \oplus_{m=0}^{\infty} M_{\lambda+m+i/n}$ is a simple V-module and we may assume that $T^{(j)} \boxtimes W^{(k)} = W^{(k+j)}$ since $T^{(j)}$ is a simple current by Proposition 20. From Condition I, there are an irreducible V-module $\widetilde{W}^{(0)}$ and a surjection $e_{\widetilde{W}^{(0)}} : \widetilde{W}^{(0)} \boxtimes W^{(0)} \to V$. Set $\mathcal{Y} = e_{\widetilde{W}^{(0)}} \mathcal{Y}^{\boxtimes}_{\widetilde{W}^{(0)}\ W^{(0)}}$ and consider a trace function $\Psi_T(Y(\mathcal{Y}))$ of $Y(\mathcal{Y})$ on T.

We first consider the images of $\Psi_T(Y(\mathcal{Y}))$ by α^k. Since $W^{(0)} \boxtimes T^{(j)} = W^{(j)}$, we have $\alpha^k(\Psi_{T^{(j)}})(Y(\mathcal{Y})) = e^{2k\pi i \mathrm{wt}(W^{(j)})} \Psi_{T^{(j)}}(Y(\mathcal{Y}))$. Therefore, we have:

$$\alpha^k(\Psi_T(Y(\mathcal{Y}))) = \alpha^k(\sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \Psi_{T^{(j)}}(Y(\mathcal{Y}))) = \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} e^{2k\pi i\lambda} e^{2\pi i kj/n} \Psi_{T^{(j)}}(Y(\mathcal{Y})),$$

which coincides with $e^{2k\pi i\lambda}$-times of the trace function of g^k

$$\mathrm{Tr}_T o(g^k) Y^T(\mathcal{U}(q_y) e_{\widetilde{W}} \mathcal{Y}^{\boxtimes}_{\widetilde{W}^{(0)}\ W^{(0)}}(\widetilde{w}, x-y)w, q_y) q^{(L(0)-c/24)}$$

on T for each $k = 0, \cdots, n-1$. Therefore,

$$\Psi_V(Y(\mathcal{Y})) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} e^{-2k\pi i\lambda} \alpha^k \Psi_T(Y(\mathcal{Y})).$$

On the other hand, since T is rational and C_2-cofinite, $S(\Psi_T)$ is a linear combination of trace functions Ψ_U on T-modules U. In particular, it is a linear combination of trace functions on V-modules. By Lemma 24, $\beta(S(\Psi_T))$ is a linear combination of trace functions of intertwining operators. Iterating it, $\beta^k(S(\Psi_T))$ are all linear combinations of trace functions of intertwining operators. Since $S\alpha^k = \beta^k S$, $S\alpha^k(\mathrm{Tr}_T Y^T(\mathcal{Y}^k))\mathcal{U}(q_y)$ are all linear combinations of trace functions and so does

$$S(\Psi_V(Y(\mathcal{Y}))) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} e^{-2k\pi i\lambda} S(\alpha^k(\Psi_T(Y(\mathcal{Y})))).$$

The second statement comes from Theorem 26 and 27. ∎

Since every rational C_2-cofinite VOA of CFT-type satisfies Condition II, we have:

Corollary 28 *Let g be a finite automorphism of a VOA T and assume that a fixed point subVOA $V := T^g$ is a C_2-cofinite of CFT-type and satisfies Condition I, If T is rational and V satisfies Condition I, then V is rational and every simple V-module is a submodule of some g^k-twisted T-module.*

References

[1] R. E. Borcherds, *Vertex algebras, Kac-Moody algebras, and the Monster*, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA 83 (1986), 3068-3071.

[2] G. Buhl, *A spanning set for VOA modules*, J. Alg. 254 (2002), no. 1,125-151.

[3] C. Dong, H. Li, and G. Mason, *Twisted representations of vertex operator algebras and associative algebras*, Internat. Math. Res. Notices **8** (1998), 389-397.

[4] C. Dong and G. Mason, *On quantum Galois theory*, Duke Math. J. **86** (1997), no.2, 305-321.

[5] M.A. Flohr, *On modular invariant partition functions of conformal field theories with logarithmic operators*, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A. (1995).

[6] I. B. Frenkel, Y.-Z. Huang, J. Lepowsky, On Axiomatic Approaches to Vertex Operator Algebras and Modules, Memoirs Amer. Math. Soc. 104, (1993).

[7] I. Frenkel, J. Lepowsky, and A. Meurman, "Vertex Operator Algebras and the Monster", Pure and Applied Math., Vol. 134, Academic Press, 1988.

[8] V. Gurarie, *Logarithmic operators in conformal field theory*, Nuclear Phys. B **410** (1993), 535-549.

[9] M. Gaberdiel and A. Neitzke, Rationality, *quasirationality, and finite W-algebra*, DAMTP-200-111.

[10] Y.-Z. Huang, *Differential equations, duality and modular invariance*, Commun. Contemp. Math. 7 (2005), no. 5, 649-706.

[11] Y.-Z. Huang, *Vertex operator algebras and the Verlinde conjecture*, Commun. Contemp. Math. 10 (2008), no. 1, 103-154.

[12] Y.-Z. Huang and J. Lepowsky, *A theory of fusion products for module categories for a vertex algebra, I*, Secta Mathematica, New Series Vol. **1** (1995), 699-756.

[13] Y.-Z. Huang, J. Lepowsky and L. Zhang *A logarithmic generalization of fusion product theory for modules for a vertex operator algebra*, Internat. J. Math. 17 (2006), no. 8, 975-1012.

[14] M. Miyamoto, *Modular invariance of vertex operator algebra satisfying C_2-cofiniteness*, Duke Math. J. 122 (2004), no. 1, 51-91.

[15] M. Miyamoto, *Flatness of Tensor Products and Semi-Rigidity for C_2-cofinite Vertex Operator Algebras I*, arXiv:0906.1407, preprint.

[16] M. Miyamoto, *Flatness of Tensor Products and Semi-Rigidity for C_2-cofinite Vertex Operator Algebras II*, arXiv:0909.3665, preprint.

[17] M. Miyamoto, *A theory of tensor products for vertex operator algebra satisfying C_2-cofiniteness*, arXiv:math/0309350, preprint.

[18] A. Milas, *Weak modules and logarithmic intertwining operators for vertex operator algebras*, Contemp. Math.,**297**, (2002) 201-225.

[19] G. Moore and N.Seiberg, *Classical and quantum conformal field theory*, Comm. Math. Phys. 123 (1989), 177-254.

[20] A. Tsuchiya and Y. Kanie, *Vertex operators in conformal field theory on $\mathbb{P}^1$ and monodromy representations of braid group*, in: Conformal Field Theory and Solvable Lattice Models, Advanced Studies in Pure Math. 16, (1988), 297-372.

[21] Y. Zhu, *Modular invariance of characters of vertex operator algebras*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **9** (1996), 237-302.